

A History of the Baptists

Volume 2

Thomas Armitage



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

<https://archive.org/details/historyofbaptist0002unse>

A
HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS:
TRACED BY THEIR
VITAL PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES,
FROM
THE TIME OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST
TO THE YEAR 1886.

— VOLUME 2 —

BY THOMAS ARMITAGE, D.D., LL.D.K
Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY J.L.M. CURRY, D.D., LL.D.,
American Minister of Court of Spain

CHICAGO:
MORNINGSIDE PUBLISHING CO.
1887

REPRINT
BAYONNE, NEW JERSEY
SMALL CHURCH SOS
2021

Table of Contents

Publisher's Preface	i
A Remarkable Incident	i
Thomas Armitage.....	ii
Preface.....	iv
Introduction.....	vii
Introductory Chapter	1
Have we a visible succession of Baptist churches down from the apostles?	1
The New Testament Period	13
Chapter 1 - John the Baptist.....	13
Chapter 2 - The Baptism of Jesus	23
Chapter 3 - The Baptist's Witness to Christ.....	33
Chapter 4 - Christ's Witness to the Baptist	43
Chapter 5 - The King in Zion – Laws of the New Kingdom	53
Chapter 6 - Pentecost and Saul	65
Chapter 7 - Saul and Gentile Missions	77
Chapter 8 - Nero and Paul, Peter and John	85
Chapter 9 - The Apostolic Churches the Only Model for All Churches	97
Chapter 10 - The Officers and Ordinances of the Apostolic Church.....	111
Chapter 11 - The Baptist Copy of the Apostolic Churches.....	129
Post-Apostolic Times.....	135
Chapter 1 - Second Century.....	135
Chapter 2 - The Third Century.....	149
Chapter 3 - The Third Century – Continued	159
Chapter 4 - The Fourth Century.....	169
Chapter 5 - The Fifth Century.....	183
Chapter 6 - The Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Centuries	197
Chapter 7 - Baptism and Baptistries in the Middle Ages.....	211
Chapter 8 - Ancient Baptismal Pictures.....	221
Chapter 9 - Christianity in the Twelfth Century	235
Chapter 10 - The Waldensians.....	251
Chapter 11 - The Bohemian Brethren and the Lollards	267
The Era of the Reformation	279
Chapter 1 - The Swiss Baptists	279
Chapter 2 - The Swiss Baptists – Continued	291
Chapter 3 - The Reformation – Zwickau and Luther.....	303
Chapter 4 - Peasants' War – Mühlhausen and Münster	311

Chapter 5 - The Reformation – German Baptists	327
Chapter 6 - The German Baptists – Continued	341
Chapter 7 - The Reformation – Baptists in the Netherlands	351
 Baptists of Great Britain	 367
Chapter 1 - Immersion in England	367
Chapter 2 - Immersion in England, Continued – Persecution.....	377
Chapter 3 - Baptists of Great Britain – John Smyth – Commonwealth.....	391
Chapter 4 - British Baptists – John Bunyan.....	409
Chapter 5 - British Baptists – John Bunyan – Continued	425
Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists	439
Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles	455
Chapter 8 - British Baptists – Commonwealth and Restoration	465
Chapter 9 - British Baptists – Liberty of Conscience – Associations – The Stennetts – Irish Baptists.....	477
Chapter 10 - The Scotch and English Baptists – Missions – Men of Note.....	491
Chapter 11 - British Baptists – The Welsh Baptists	511
 The American Baptists.....	 527
Chapter 1 - The Colonial Period – Pilgrims and Puritans.....	527
Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams.....	535
Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island.....	547
Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches.....	563
Chapter 5 - Chauncey – Knollys – Miles and the Swansea Church.....	577
Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists	587
Chapter 7 - New Centers of Baptist Influence – South Carolina – Maine – Pennsylvania – New Jersey.....	603
Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia	621
Chapter 9 - Baptists of Connecticut and New York.....	635
Chapter 10 - The Baptists of North Carolina, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont and Georgia	651
Chapter 11 - Baptists and the Revolutionary War	667
Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty.....	683
Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe	699
Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home.....	717
Chapter 15 - Preachers – Educators – Authors	731
Chapter 16 - Theological Seminaries – Literature – Revivals	747
Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies.....	765
Chapter 18 - Baptists in British America and Australia.....	787

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE

This edition of Armitage's *History of the Baptists* has been carefully reformatted and corrected to produce a print copy of the book. The original woodcut images have not been included because they do not appreciably add to the information provided in the book. The files used to prepare this book are available as WordPerfect and Adobe Acrobat files and are available upon request by email to pastor@smallchurchsos.com.

Chapter 3 - Baptists of Great Britain – John Smyth – Commonwealth

Rev. John Smyth, educated at Cambridge, became vicar of Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, and a determined foe of the Separatists. After examining their sentiments for 'nine months,' however, he renounced episcopacy as unscriptural and was cast into the Marshalsea Prison, Southwark, but being liberated, he became pastor of the Separatist Church at Gainsborough in 1602. William Brewster was a Separatist at Gainsborough, but removed to Scrooby near Bawtry, where Clifton became pastor, with Robinson as assistant. Both these little flocks, however, were driven from their homes, Smyth fleeing to Amsterdam, probably in 1606, where he joined Johnson. Clifton and Robinson followed in 1608, settling first at Amsterdam, then at Leyden. In 1620 a portion of the Church at Leyden migrated to Plymouth, New England, with Brewster as elder, and formed the first Congregational Church in America. On arriving in Amsterdam, Smyth at first united with the 'ancient' English Separatist Church there, in charge of Johnson, with Ainsworth as teacher. At that time the Separatists of Amsterdam were in warm controversy on the true nature of a visible Church. Smyth published a work on the fallen Church, entitled *The Character of the Beast*, and a tractate of seventy-one pages against infant baptism and in favor of believers baptism. For this he was disfellowshipped by the first Church, his former friends charging him with open war against God's covenant, and the murder of the souls of babes and sucklings, by depriving them of the visible seal of salvation.

This led Smyth, Helwys, Morton and thirty-six others to form a new Church which should practice believer's baptism and reject infant baptism. Finding themselves unbaptized, they were in a strait. They were on good terms with the Dutch Baptists, but would not receive their baptism, lest this should recognize them as a

true Church; for they believed that the true Churches of Christ had perished. Besides, Smyth did not believe with them in the unlawfulness of a Christian to serve as a magistrate, nor on the freedom of the will and the distinctive points of Calvinism, he being an Arminian, which points he considered vital. He believed that the Apostolical Church model was lost, and determined on its recovery. He renounced the figment of a historical, apostolic succession, insisting that where two or three organize according to the teachings of the New Testament, they form as true a Church of Christ as that of Jerusalem, though they stand alone in the earth. With the design of restoring this pattern, he baptized himself on his faith in Christ in 1608, then baptized Thomas Helwys with about forty others, and so formed a new Church in Amsterdam. In most things this body was Baptist, as that term is now used, with some difference. This is established by their four extant forms, of what is in substance, one confession of faith. Two of these were written by Smyth and are signed by others, and the other two came from the same company, probably under the lead of Helwys. Their theology is Arminian, they claim that the Church is composed of baptized believers only, that 'only the baptized are to taste of the Lord's Supper,' and that the magistrates shall not, by virtue of their office, meddle with matters of conscience in religion.

Smyth and his congregation met in a large bakery for a time, but he soon saw his mistake in his hasty Se-baptism, and offered to join the Dutch congregation of Baptists known as 'Waterlanders,' under the pastoral charge of Lubberts Gerrits. Part of his congregation, under the leadership of Helwys, would not unite with Smyth in this movement, but excluded him from their fellowship and warned the Dutch Church not to receive him. Soon after this

Smyth died, August, 1612, and the Dutch body recognized his company. Meanwhile the question had arisen with Helwys and his followers whether they were doing right by remaining in Holland, to avoid persecution in England, and at the peril of their lives they had returned to London, in 1611, and formed the first general Baptist Church there, 1612-14. Little is known of its history beyond the general statement that the Dutch Baptists of London rallied around Helwys and John Morton, his successor, that it was located in Newgate, and that in 1626 it numbered one hundred and fifty persons. Helwys published a work defending their course in braving persecution, and probably translated a Dutch treatise on baptism in 1618. No account is given of his death, but Taylor dates it at 'about' 1623. Masson says, in his *Life of Milton*, 'This obscure Baptist congregation seems to have become the depository for all England of the absolute principle of liberty of conscience expressed in the Amsterdam Confession as distinct from the more stunted principle advocated by the general body of the Independents. Not only did Helwys's folks differ from the Independents generally on the subject of infant baptism and *dipping*; they differed also on the power of the magistrate in matters of belief and conscience. It was, in short, from this little dingy meeting-house, somewhere in Old London, that there flashed out first in England the absolute doctrine of religious liberty.'

So far as is known, the Amsterdam Confession of the Baptists is the first which laid down the full principle of religious freedom, after the Swiss Confession of 1527. It is absolutely the first now known to take positive ground in favor of the salvation of all infants who die in infancy, from the time that Augustine taught the detestable doctrine that unbaptized infants who die are not admitted into heaven. Wickliff held that they are saved

without baptism, but his doctrine was not formulated by a Christian body. Also, in defining the limits of Church and State, they came down to those foundation principles which the Independents had not reached. Ainsworth's Confession said: 'The government should protect true believers, strengthen the proper administration of the true worship, punish transgressors, and uproot false worship.' Helwys understood things better. He sent a copy of his work on religious liberty with a letter to James I, in which he boldly says: 'The king is a mortal man and not God, therefore hath no power over the immortal souls of his subjects, to make laws and ordinances for them, and to set spiritual lords over them. If the king has authority to make spiritual lords and laws, then he is an immortal God, and not a mortal man.' No English king had heard such words before. The Independents were far in advance of the Puritans and the Presbyterians on this subject; but even Johnson said: 'Princes may and ought to abolish all false worship, and to establish the true worship and ministry appointed by God in his word, commanding and compelling their subjects to come into and practice none other than this.' The Amsterdam Baptist Confession bravely said: 'The magistrate is not, by virtue of his office, to meddle with religion or matters of conscience; to force and compel men to this or that form of religion or doctrine, but to leave the Christian religion free to every man's conscience, and to handle only civil transgressors, for Christ is the only King and Lawgiver of the Church and conscience.'

When the Brownists left the English State Church, they objected to its hierarchy, liturgy, constitution and government, as antichristian. Smyth, therefore, broke with them on the issue that if that Church was apostate, as a daughter of Rome, then its clergy were not qualified to administer Christ's ordinances. The Brownists,

however, considered them valid, and called the English Church their 'mother,' while they denounced her as 'harlot' and 'Babylon;' but Smyth, having been christened in her pale, concluded that he was yet unbaptized. Bishop Hall caught this point keenly, and was severe on the Brownists when he opposed Smyth. He wrote:

'You that cannot abide a false Church, why do you content yourselves with a false sacrament? especially since our Church, not being yet gathered to Christ, is no Church, and therefore her baptism a nullity!...He (Smyth) tells you true; your station is unsafe; either you must forward to him, or back to us...You must go forward to Anabaptism, or come back to us. All your rabbins cannot answer that charge of your rebaptized brother...If our baptism be good, then is our constitution good...What need you to surfeit of another man's trencher?...Show you me where the Apostles baptized in a *bason*!'

Smyth having rejected infant baptism also on its merits as a human institution, Ainsworth said, in 1609, that he had gone 'over to the abomination of the Anabaptists.' Bishop Hall wrote the above words in 1610, calling him then 'your rebaptized brother,' which indicates that he left the Brownists about 1608. His enemies have represented him as hair-brained, fickle and fond of novelty. But Schaff-Herzog does him the justice to say that: 'Seized by the time-spirit, he was restless, fervid, earnest and thoroughgoing...A man of incorruptible simplicity, beautiful humility, glowing charity, a fair scholar and a good preacher.' His writings show that he thirsted for the truth; and several times he shifted his positions before he felt sure that he stood on solid ground, a fact creditable to his convictions and moral courage. As to his Se-baptism the following things seem clear, namely:

1. *That he did baptize himself when he cast aside his infant baptism.* He believed that no

man had a pure baptism or could administer the same, not only because of the corruption of baptism, as then practiced, but because of moral defection in all the Churches. This was no new doctrine. The Donatists held that the validity of baptism was affected by the bad life of the administrator; and Cyprian asks: 'Who can consecrate water who is himself unholy, and has not the Holy Spirit?' But Smyth was feeling his way far back beyond this to the Gospel ground, that the validity of baptism has no regard to the administrator, as it is governed by the faith of the candidate. He denied the need of all visible succession in the ministry and ordinances, and yet his sincere but impulsive mind was held in secret thrall to this subtlety. He denied that the fable of antiquity is an attribute of a true Church, and yet he would found a new line of baptizers, to give purity to the ordinance in the future. He evidently reasoned and decided thus: 'Let the fallen Churches stand alone. They have turned Christ's ordinance out of doors and established their own, so I cut loose from them and throw myself directly into the hands of God. I take the last method left of honoring him, and he knows my singleness of heart. My infant baptism was meaningless, a pious fraud practiced upon me, and its alleged blessings are mere nursery pictures. They have thrown shame on the Gospel, blunted my conviction of truth, and put my personal faith in Christ to a deep blush. Hence I will cut the last thread that binds me to "the defection of Antichrist." Logic took him to that point, but love to Christ carried him further, and he resolved to offer himself to Christ in baptism, come what might, and he baptized himself, in obedience to an imperative sense of duty. There is a legend of Thekla, the unbaptized martyr, that when led out to the wild beasts, she threw herself into a trench full of water, and shouted, with joy: 'In the name of Jesus Christ, I am baptized on my last day!'

Without her lot, Smyth possessed the same spirit. He denied the arrogance that salvation is lodged in ordinances, that God has given them into the keeping of any body of men to dispense, rejecting whom they please. Baptism was to him a right and privilege from God, and because it had been forced upon him as a child, the extreme view of the Church now forced him, as he believed, to throw aside all human intervention in the matter. Yet in his Confession he explicitly expresses his faith in an accredited ministry, a regenerate body, but he could not trace it through one century, not to say sixteen. He concluded, therefore, that it made no matter whether he, being unbaptized, baptized himself, or another unbaptized man baptized him. This was his Puritan mode of cutting himself adrift from the last tic of popery in Protestantism. The result was the same, so far as baptismal succession was concerned, whether he baptized himself or was baptized by an unbaptized person. His entire being was impelled by that sentiment, and the quicksilver no more changes the weather, than eccentricity led him to Se-baptism.

However mistaken he was in his reasoning, he knew, as a matter of fact, that nearly half the so-called countries of the world are unable to tell by record whether the Gospel was first preached to them by ministers or laymen, much less can their personal baptisms be traced. He could not tell whether the man who brought it to the British Isles was himself baptized, or if so, who baptized him, where, when or how. Smyth held his own consecration to Christ in baptism acceptable to Christ, and he was better satisfied with it himself, than he had ever been with his infant baptism, of which others had told him. These being his motives to Se-baptism, we may now notice that:

2. *Its proof is found in his own uncontradicted statements and those of his contemporaries.* He defended his act by

claiming that when succession is broken off, men are not bound to join fallen Churches: 'But may, being as yet unbaptized, baptize themselves, AS WE DID, and proceed to build churches themselves.' When Clifton asked him by what right he baptized himself, he replied: 'As you, when there was not a true Church in the world, took upon you to set up a true Church...Seeing, when all Christ's visible ordinances are lost, then two men joining together may make a Church, as you say, why may they not baptize, seeing they cannot enjoin unto Christ but by baptism?...Each of them unbaptized, hath power to assume baptism *each for himself*, with others in communion.' Barebone charges against the Baptists, 1642, that they baptized themselves by the 'Way of new baptizing lately begun;' they have no warrant from heaven, he argues, 'As had John the Baptist, to set up baptism themselves,' nor to baptize themselves and others. In Clifton's *Plea for Infants*, 1610, he calls upon Smyth to bring 'Warrant from the Scripture, that you being unbaptized may baptize yourself... Resolve me, that you can baptize yourself into the Church, being out of it, yea, and where there was no Church.' In the same year, J.H. published a book against Smyth, in which he says: 'Tell me one thing, Maister Smyth, by what rule baptized you yourself?...It was wonder you would not receive your baptism from the Dutch Anabaptists, but you will be holier than all.' Ainsworth, Robinson, Bernard and others, charge Smyth with being a Se-Baptist (self-Baptist), and he took the greatest pains to defend his own act as absolutely necessary.

3. *Whether he dipped himself is not so clear, but all the circumstances, with a few statements of that day, imply that he did.* Those who wrote against the Baptists after 1640 make no distinction on the matter of immersion between the Baptists of that period and those

who had continued down from 1610, nor report any change amongst them, from affusion or perfusion to dipping. On the contrary, they speak of them as one stock from Smyth downward. Sometimes they speak of him as the father of English 'Anabaptism,' and uniformly, in contempt, they call them 'Dippers.' Barebone says in his Discourse: 'They want a Dipper, that had authority from heaven as had John, whom they please to call a Dipper.' Bishop Hall's remark, 1610, when speaking of Smyth as 'your rebaptized brother,' is very significant. In scornful sarcasm he demands of the Brownists, who used affusion: 'Show me where the Apostles baptized in a *bason*! What need you to surfeit of another man's trencher?' The very point of his thrust implies that Smyth had dipped himself, contrary to their practice, and that he had Apostolic authority for dipping as baptism. It further implies that the meat on Smyth's 'trencher' had nauseated them, because, like the Apostles, he had discarded the 'bason.' Featley, in what Orme calls his 'ridiculous book,' *The Dippers Dipt over Head and Ears*, complains of the 'new leaven,' because they dipped, and says: 'It cannot be proved that any of the ancient Anabaptists maintained any such position, there being three ways of baptizing, either by dipping, or washing, or sprinkling.' [*Dippers Dipt*, p. 187] But in this declaration he contradicts himself several times, as we shall see. He clearly states their then current practice when he says, that the sick cannot, 'After the manner of the Anabaptists, be carried to rivers or wells, and there be dipt and plunged in them.' He adds, that they held 'Weekly Conventicles, rebaptized hundreds of men and women together in the twilight in rivulets, and some arms of the Thames and elsewhere, dipping them over head and ears.' He bitterly complains that they 'Flock in great multitudes to their Jordans, and both sexes enter the river, and are dipped after *their*

manner;' and that they had followed these terrible practices 'near the place of my residence for more than twenty years.' He wrote this Jan. 10, 1644, which would carry him back to 1624, at least. But he never accuses the English Baptists of substituting dipping for some other practice which they had previously followed. He gives not one hint that in England they had ever been any thing else but 'Dippers,' an unaccountable silence, if they had practiced something else there within the previous fifty years.

Directly to the contrary, his whole book assumes that the Baptists of his day were the veritable descendants of the Münster men. He calls Storke 'The father of the Anabaptists of *our age*,' and a 'blockhead' from whom 'the chiefs flew into England,' when he was hewn down in Germany; and makes Knipperdolling their 'Patriarch.' He alleges that they 'stript themselves stark naked when they flock to their Jordans to be dipt,' and is delighted to tell us, on the authority of Gastius, that at Vienna 'Many Anabaptists were so tied together in chains, that they drew the other after them into the river, wherein they were suffocated.' This, he thought, the proper punishment for their sin, and bewails that their successors were treated more leniently in England. His words are: 'They who drew others into the whirlpool of error, by constraint drew one another into the river to be drowned; and they who profaned baptism by a *second dipping*, rue it by a third immersion. But the punishment of these Catabaptists we leave to them who have the legislative power in their hands; who, though by present connivance they may seem to give them line, yet no doubt it is that they may more entangle themselves, and more easily be caught.' He clearly intends us to understand that these Continental Baptists had been immersed first as children, second on their faith, which 'profaned' the first, and entitled them to drowning in a 'third immersion.' He

says that this 'Anabaptist' fire was subdued under the reigns of James and Elizabeth, but it had revived again from 'the ashes.' Amongst the 'six things' which he charges as peculiar to the sect, the first is: 'That none are rightly baptized' but those who are dipped, or as he loves to express it, those who 'Go into the water, and there be dipt over head and ears;' and he fails to hint that the English Baptists had ever done otherwise, when baptizing. Wilson's *History of Dissenting Churches* (I. p. 29, 30) says of Smyth:

'He saw grounds to consider immersion as the true and only meaning of the word baptism, and that it should be administered to those alone who were capable of professing their faith in Christ. The absurdity of Smyth's conduct appeared in nothing more conspicuously than in this: That not choosing to apply to the German Baptists, and wanting a proper administrator, he baptized himself, which procured him to be called a Se-baptist. Crosby, indeed, has taken great pains to vindicate him from this charge, though it seems with little success. His principles and conduct soon drew upon him an host of opponents, the chief of whom were Johnson, Ainsworth, Robinson, Jessop and Clifton. The controversy begun in 1606, about the time Smyth settled in Amsterdam. Soon afterward he removed with his followers to Leyden, where he continued to publish various books in defense of his opinions.'

Neal says that he 'Settled with his disciples at Ley, where being at a loss for a proper administrator of the ordinance of baptism, he *plunged* himself, and then performed the ceremony upon others.' [*Hist. Puritans*, I, 243] In Smyth's case, it is nothing to the purpose whether the Mennonites, Waterlanders, or those 'Anabaptists' called 'Aspersi' used affusion or not, as he repudiated them all. There is not a particle of evidence that he affused himself, and it is a cheap caricature to imagine that he disrobed himself, walked into a stream, then

lifted handfuls of water, pouring then liberally upon his own head, shoulders and chest. We have the same reason for believing that he immersed Helwys, as that he dipped himself. Masson writes: 'Helwisse's folk differed from the Independents generally on the subject of infant baptism and dipping.' And as he thinks that Bugher was a member of that 'congregation' in 1614, the man who described a baptized person as one 'dipped for dead in the water,' the fair inference is carried that the first General Baptist Church of London was composed of immersed 'folk.'

Notwithstanding that Edward Wightman, a Baptist of Burton-on-Trent, had been burnt at Lichfield, April 11th, 1611, and that persecution of his brethren continued without martyrdom, they had so increased in 1626 that they had eleven General Baptist Churches in England: which, as Featley sourly says, had increased to forty-seven of various sorts in 1644. Some claim that a Particular Baptist Church was formed at Shrewsbury in 1627, and another at Bickenhall, near Taunton, in 1630: but it is more likely that the first of this order was established by John Spilsbury at Wapping in 1633. These terms originated in the fact that the Arminian Baptists held to a general and the Calvinistic Baptists to a particular atonement; hence they adopted these titles.

Spilsbury's Church came into existence on this wise. In 1616 the first congregation of Independents had been gathered in London, under the pastoral care of Henry Jacob, who was succeeded by John Lathrop. A number of this society came to reject infant baptism and were permitted to form a distinct Church, September 12, 1633; with John Spilsbury for their pastor; and, according to Lord Selborn, in the St. Mary's Chapel case, Norwich, for a number of years after its formation it was a Strict Communion body, so far as the Supper was concerned. Crosby says that 'most or all of

these received a new baptism.' In 1638 William Kiffin, Thomas Wilson and others, left Lathrop's Independent Church, then under charge of Mr. Jessey, and united with Spilsbury's Church. Wilson, in his *History of Dissenting Churches*, says that some time after this, disputes arose in Spilsbury's Church on the subject of 'mixed communion,' and Kiffin with others withdrew to form a new Church, Devonshire Square. At page 410 he explains what he means by 'mixed communion,' it was not the reception of unbaptized persons either to membership or the Supper, but 'mixed communion' with unimmersed ministers. His words are: 'In a course of time a controversy arose in that Church on the propriety of admitting persons *to preach* who had not been baptized by immersion. This produced an amicable separation, headed by Mr. Kiffin, who seems to have been averse to the plan of mixed communion, but the two societies kept up a friendly correspondence.' Not only that, but they cooperated in resisting the contumely of their enemies and in building up each other in the faith. By 1643 the Calvinistic Baptist Churches in and about London had increased to seven, while the non-Calvinistic Churches numbered thirty-nine, forty-six in all. The English Calvinistic Churches, together with a French Church of the same faith, eight in all, issued a Confession of Faith in 1643, of fifty articles; not to erect a standard of faith, but to close the mouths of slanderers. Its preface says of their enemies:

'They, finding us out of that common road-way themselves walk, have smote us and taken away our veil, that so we may by them be odious in the eyes of all that behold us, and in the hearts of all that think upon us, which they have done both in pulpit and print, charging us with holding free-will, falling away from grace, denying original sin, disclaiming a magistracy, denying to assist

them either in persons or purse in any of their lawful commands, doing acts unseemly in the dispensing the ordinance of baptism, not to be named amongst Christians. All which charges we disclaim as notoriously untrue, though by reason of these calumnies cast upon us, many that fear God are discouraged and forestalled in harboring a good thought, either of us or what we profess, and many that know not God (*are*) encouraged, if they can find the place of our meeting, to get together in clusters to stone us, as looking upon us as a people holding such things as that we are not worthy to live.'

This Confession was signed by sixteen ministers, two from each Church; and amongst them both John Spilsbury and William Kiffin, a significant fact in its bearings on the ground of their after separation. A second edition was published in 1644, and a third in 1646, the last with an appendix by Benjamin Coxe. Edward Barber, the minister of the Church meeting in Bishopsgate Street, had published a treatise in 1641, to prove that 'our Lord Christ ordained dipping.' Now, in this 'Confession,' Art. XXXIII says, that a Church is 'a company of visible saints...being baptized into the faith of the Gospel;' and Art. XXXIX, that baptism is 'to be dispensed upon persons professing faith, or that are made disciples, who, upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized, and after to partake of the Lord's Supper.' Article XL defines the manner of baptizing 'to be dipping or plunging the whole body under water.' These articles, signed by Spilsbury as the fifth name and Kiffin as the eleventh, show that these two worthies were entirely agreed as to the question of immersion on a confession of faith in Christ as a prerequisite to the Supper, and that Wilson was right in stating that the disturbing element between them related to 'mixed communion,' but not amongst members of the same Church. They must all be 'dipped under water' on entering the 'company of saints' made 'visible' by this expression of their faith as 'disciples,'

and 'after' that 'partake of the Lord's Supper.' Spilsbury and Kiffin being agreed here, as their signatures show, the controversy between them was 'on the propriety of admitting persons *to preach* who had not been baptized by immersion.' Wilson says that Kiffin 'seemed averse' to mixed communion after that stamp, and left amicably, so that their fellowship was not disturbed at all on the subject treated of in the 'Confession,' namely, communion at the Lord's Supper.

A most interesting branch of this history connects the name of Henry Jessey with this period. Henry Jacob continued to serve the Independent Church which he founded in 1616, until 1624, when he removed to America, and was succeeded as pastor by John Lathrop, who also went to America in 1634, and settled first at Scituate and then at Barnstable, Mass. Then Jessey became its supply in 1635, and its pastor in 1637. At one time or another this Church was seriously disturbed on the subject of baptism. Wilson tells us that under Mr. Lathrop's ministry 'some of the society entertained doubts as to the validity of baptism performed by their own minister; and one person who indulged these scruples carried his child to be baptized in the parish church.' This giving offense to several persons, the subject was discussed at a general meeting of the society; when the question was put it was carried in the negative, and resolved by the majority not to make any declaration at present, '*whether or no parish Churches were true Churches.*' This action led to the withdrawal of those 'who were dissatisfied about the lawfulness of infant baptism,' and to the formation of the Calvinistic Baptist Church of 1633, under Spilsbury's ministry. Under the ministry of Jessey others left and united with the Baptists; six persons in 1638, a larger number in 1641, and a greater number still in 1643. These movements created frequent debates in the Independent Church.

'This,' says Wilson, 'put Mr. Jessey upon studying the controversy. The result was that he himself also changed his sentiments...His first conviction was about *the mode of baptism*; and though he continued for two or three years to baptize children, he did it by *immersion*. About the year 1644 the controversy with respect to the *subjects* of baptism was revived in his Church, when several gave up *infant* baptism, and among the rest Mr. Jessey...1645 he submitted to immersion, which was performed by Mr. Hanserd Knollys.' [*Hist. Diss. Chs.*, I, p. 43]

It seems that Jessey's Church had become large by 1640, and by 'mutual consent' had divided, 'just half being with Praise-God Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Jessey.' They were in controversy on the subjects and method of baptism, Blunt and Jessey being the leaders of those who had embraced Baptist views, numbering fifty-three, and Barebone the leader of those who remained Pedobaptists. The fact that the eight Churches formulated baptism as a 'dipping or plunging of the whole body under water,' is sufficient to show that they themselves had been organized and had grown up in that order; as well as the declaration in the preface, that they had been accused of 'unseemly acts in dispensing the ordinance of baptism,' namely, by immersing nude persons. If they had not immersed from their origin, they were slandered in the statement, that they immersed at all, to say nothing of alleged indecencies, 'not to be named by Christians,' in connection with their immersions. To say that Spilsbury's Church immersed in 1643, but had not practiced dipping from 1633, is to charge that Church with changing the form of its ordinance, and with repelling a slander to which it had never been subjected; for the accusation that it immersed naked persons carried with it the charge of dipping, whether the alleged nudity were true or false. Here, then, we have

fifty-three persons, with Jessey at their head, seeking immersion; but they will not go for it to Spilsbury's Church, though, clearly, he had practiced it since 1633. And why? According to the anonymous account attributed to Kiffin, because none had then, May, 1640, 'so practiced in England to professed believers!' and so they must send to Holland to import dipping! What do they mean by this?

We have already seen that the members of Jessey's Independent Church were great sticklers for ministerial regularity, and lodged the validity of baptism very largely in the administrator. Nay, some of his own congregation had refused to acknowledge the authority of John Lathrop to baptize, and one member who believed in infant baptism, whose child Lathrop had baptized, would not accept it as properly done and took his babe to the parish Church to have it baptized over again on the ground of this irregularity; and so sensitive were 'the majority' on the subject that they refused to say whether or not the parish Churches were true Churches. Lathrop had been trained for the Church of England at Cambridge, had received Episcopal ordination, and served in that ministry in Kent; but no matter, having gone over to dissent, some of his own people doubted whether his baptisms were valid! And there are many reasons for believing that this is a similar case, and that these fifty-three members of the same congregation declined to accept immersion from what they considered an unauthorized administrator. They intended to be immersed, but the English Baptists at that time were universally accused of self-baptism, some of them having received their baptism from John Smyth, and while the Baptists denied this with spirit, none of them thought of insisting on a baptismal succession, but argued that any unbaptized Christian could baptize if needful. This point was in hot dispute at the time. The author of *Persecution for*

Religion Judged and Condemned, 1615, labors hard to show that it is not necessary that he who baptizes should be a baptized person. Barclay and others suppose that John Morton, who was with Smyth and Helwys in Amsterdam, was the author of this book. Whether Smyth immersed them or not, it is quite clear that they received no baptism after that which he administered to them. Some time before Smyth's death he frankly retracted his error in baptizing himself and them; therefore Helwys charged him as guilty of 'the sin against the Holy Ghost.' In his 'last book' he allows that Helwys still held that baptism to be valid, and accuses him of unChristianizing all who did not walk to his 'line and level,' even 'upon pain of damnation.' He says: 'If Master Helwys's position be true, that every two or three that see the truth of baptism may begin to baptize, and need not join to former true Churches, where they may have their baptism orderly from ordained ministers, then the order of the primitive Church was order for them and those times only, and this disorder will establish baptism of private persons.' But although Smyth had repudiated the doctrine which he himself had introduced, yet the English Baptists clearly held it at that time, and as clearly the fifty-three refused baptism at their hands because they held them to be irregularly baptized. Evidently Keal regarded the matter in this light. He pronounces Binnt's conduct in going over to Holland to be immersed 'strange and unaccountable;' but suggests this solution of the matter: 'Unless the Dutch Anabaptists could derive this pedigree in an uninterrupted line from the Apostles, the first reviver of this usage must have been unbaptized, and, consequently, not capable of communicating the ordinance to others. [*Hist. Puritans*, I, 497] He understood immersion to have been revived in England at that time, but as the 'reviver' was not in the immersionist succession, Jessey's people thought his

followers incapable of immersing them. Perkins and others held that if a Turk should be converted, and led others to Christ, he might baptize them, being unbaptized himself. John Robinson had charged that the Baptists of England were unbaptized on the ground that they had not received baptism from any authorized source, having rejected the Church of England as an apostasy. Even the Confession of the Eight Churches seemed to aim at covering the case by that article which says, the 'person designed by Christ to dispense baptism the Scripture holds forth to be a disciple; it being nowhere tied to a particular office or person extraordinarily sent,' How natural it was, then for these brethren from an Independent Church to conclude that the immersion of the English Baptists being irregular, they not being properly immersed, therefore, that they must send to Holland for a pure baptism through a qualified administrator.

This charge was reiterated with great asperity. In 1691 Collins denies that they received their baptism from John Smyth, pronouncing the allegation 'absolutely untrue.' Yet, even later than that, John Wall persisted in declaring that their baptism was 'Abhorred of all Christians; for they received their baptism from one Mr. Smyth, who baptized himself; one who was cast out of a Church.' Edward Hutchinson, however, 1676, referring to this very case says, that after this godly band of men had resolved to lay aside infant baptism, 'Fears, tremblings and temptations did attend them, lest they should be mistaken...The great objection was the want of an *administrator*; which, as I have heard, was removed by sending certain messengers to Holland, whence they were supplied.' [*Covenant and Baptism*] The greater part of the English Baptists looked upon this act as savoring of popery, it looked like seeking a baptismal succession. And the fact, that it ignored their baptism, may account for the use

of the above article in the Confession. It was held that the Collegiants of Holland had received their immersion from the Polish Baptists, and when Batte, one of their teachers, had immersed Blunt there, he returned to England in 1641, and immersed Blacklock, one of the fifty-three, and they the rest of that company. But they never immersed the eight Churches; they having been dipped before the fifty-three became Baptists at all; they and their descendants have continued that practice ever since.

The rapid growth of the English Baptists at this time, in influence and numbers, aroused such fiery but strong minds as Thomas Edwards and Dr. Featley amazingly. In the Dedicatory Epistle to his 'Gangræna.' published 1646, he tells Parliament that 'The sects have been growing upon us, even from the first year of your sitting, and have every year increased more and more, things have been bad a great while, but this last year they have grown intolerable.' He speaks of an order of February 16th, 1643, in which Parliament had 'hindered' unordained ministers 'from preaching and dipping,' but says that they were 'bought off and released by some above.' On p. 16 he combats the opinion that the 'army commanders and common soldiers' were Independents. No; 'there would not be found one in six of that way,' for the army was 'made up and commanded of Anabaptism.' He says, on p. 58, that the 'Anabaptists' have 'stirred up the people to embody themselves, and to join in church fellowship, setting up independent government, rebaptizing and dipping many hundreds.' He denounces them on pp. 65, 66 because 'They send forth into several counties in this kingdom, from their Churches in London, as church acts, several emissaries members of their Churches, to preach and spread their errors, to dip, to gather and settle Churches;' yea, 'some of them went into the North as far as York,' where some

were rebaptized 'in the river Ouse,' and the water was 'so hot as if it had been in the middle of summer.' On p. 95, part ii, he declares that Independents in armies, county, city, (were) falling daily to Anabaptists.' On p. 149 he says that they abounded at Hull, Beverley, York and Halifax. On p. 146, he tells Parliament that Oats went into the country from town to town 'dipping many in rivers,' the rich at ten shillings a head, and the poor at two shillings and six pence. Part iii, p. 139, shows him cut to the heart, because the Baptists 'kill tender young persons and ancient, with dipping them all over in rivers, in the depth of winter.' His heart is comforted, however, on p. 194, to be able to say that 'We shall find no Church sounder for doctrine than the Church of Scotland, nor greater enemies, not only against papacy and prelacy, but against Anabaptists.' But as he could not help himself, he nobly proposes, on p. 108, to prove a certain story which he has told, if his opponent will join the Presbyterians in a petition to Parliament for the forbidding of all dipping and rebaptization, and exemplary punishment of all such dippers as Brother Kiffin.' Yet he tells us frankly, on p. 178, that he never saw Denne, Clarkson, Paul Hobson, Lamb, Web, Marshal and many others: 'I know them not so much as by face, having never so much to my knowledge as seen them.'

The Confession of the Eight Churches was issued in the midst of the revolution, which, for the time, overthrew the Stuart monarchy. The issue between king and Parliament was still doubtful, as Marston Moor and Naseby were not yet fought. With great unanimity the Baptists enrolled themselves on the side of the people, and fought bravely for liberty, civil and religious. It has been inferred that Bunyan fought with the Cavaliers; mainly, from his silence on the subject. But at this time he was not a Baptist, and so there is no clear case that any Baptist drew his sword for the king. Their

choice is easily explained. They had suffered tyranny too long and hated it too much to fight for a prince who was a tyrant on principle, who had Laud, the bigot and persecutor, for his spiritual adviser. Their patriotism soon won them high honor. Cromwell's son-in-law, Charles Fleetwood, Colonel and Lord-Deputy of Ireland, was a Baptist; as well as Major-General Harrison, who held the confidence of the Protector for so many years, and who owed his advancement to real merit. Lord Clarendon speaks of him as having 'an understanding capable of being trusted in any business,' a man who was 'looked upon as inferior to few after Cromwell and Ireton in the councils of the officers and in the government of the agitators: and there were few men with whom Cromwell more communicated, or upon whom he more depended for the conduct of any thing committed to him.' When the Protector dissolved the Long Parliament, an act which brought odium upon him, above all others he intrusted Harrison with that delicate duty, because of his prudence and integrity. Harrison was also appointed one of the judges to try Charles I for treason to his people, and he signed the death-warrant. At the time of the trial he held Baptist views, but he and his wife were not baptized until 1657. A contemporary chronicle informs us that his baptism occurred in the depth of winter, but we know not with what congregation he united.

Harrison became estranged from Cromwell in later years, because he regarded him as too ambitious. Cromwell fearing his military ability and popular influence threw him into prison; and having embraced enthusiastic views concerning the Fifth Monarchy, which Christ was about to set up on earth, he lost caste with the more sober Baptists, although they sympathized with him largely in his estimate of the Protector. Under Charles II, Harrison was executed at Charing Cross for the part he had

taken in the death of Charles I, but to the last he justified that act. His execution was a piece of the most vulgar butchery. It occurred November 13th, 1660, and Pepys writes, that he went 'To see Major-General Harrison hanged, drawn and quartered: which was done, he looking as cheerful as any man could be in that condition. He was presently cut down, and his head and heart shown to the people;' and Ludlow adds, that his head was carried on the front of the sled upon which Chief-Justice Coke was drawn to execution. Harrison told his judges that he had no reason to be ashamed of the cause in which he was engaged, nor do his Baptist successors under Victoria blush for him.

Another prominent officer who cherished Baptist sentiments was COLONEL JOHN HUTCHINSON, who must be reckoned amongst the choicest spirits of his times. Lucy, his wife, was in every way worthy of him. She wrote a Memoir of him, which is one of the most charming biographies in English literature, for in point of learning she had scarcely an equal amongst the women of England, and not a superior. Her husband was born in 1616, was the son of a baronet and received his education at Cambridge. He loved God, prayer, meditation and the study of the Scriptures, and having ample property, settled in quiet retirement after his marriage. But when the civil war broke out he threw himself into the cause of the people with great patriotism, and after the death of Charles became famous as the governor of Nottingham and its castle. There he exerted immense influence for English liberty, and became a great favorite with his countrymen. He and his wife were first Presbyterians, and she tells the interesting story of their conversion to Baptist principles. Her own mind became deeply interested in the question of infant baptism, from the fact that she looked for the birth of a babe; and having examined the Scriptures with her husband,

doubts arose in their minds on that subject.

After the birth of their child they consulted a number of Presbyterian divines at their home, but concluded that the word of God gave no warrant for its baptism. This laid them open to much calumny and blame, but they stood firmly in their integrity. Lucy was the daughter of Sir Alien Apsley, governor of the Tower, while her husband's mother was a Byron, of which family the great poet came; and their influence for patriotism, consecration to Christ and family virtue, was their great shield against molestation.

As Colonel Hutchinson had been one of the judges who condemned Charles to death, he was imprisoned first in the Tower and then in Sandown Castle, where he died in Christian triumph in 1644. He was eloquent, fearless and powerful in the House of Commons, and so firm a defender of religious liberty, that Fox, the founder of the Friends, found him his chief protector when a prisoner at Nottingham.

We have already seen that John Spilsbury was a man of high repute in the Baptist ministry in those days, yet not much more than this has come down to us concerning him. His name, however, is mentioned for the last time as standing side by side with that of Kiffin in the Declaration against Tenner's Rebellion, 1662. His colleagues now best known to us are Kiffin and Knollys.

WILLIAM KIFFIN was born in 1616, and lost both his parents in the Plague when but nine years old. William but just escaped death, having nine plague-boils on his body. At thirteen he became an apprentice to John Lilburn, the noted brewer, but at fifteen he left his master, and wandering about the streets of London in a melancholy manner, he passed with the crowd into St. Antholius's Church, where Mr. Foxley preached on the Fifth Commandment. He thought the preacher knew his case, so exactly did he describe his duty to

his master, and he quietly returned home. After that, he heard Norton, the Puritan, preach from 'There is no peace to the wicked,' and was deeply stirred, but on hearing Davenport, in Coleman Street, from 'The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin,' he says: 'I found my fears to vanish, and my heart filled with love to Jesus.' After the manner of Bunyan he alternated for months between hope and fear, temptation and triumph, until he joined the Church of which Lathrop was pastor. After enduring much persecution for holding religious meetings in Southwark, and being imprisoned, in 1643, he went to Holland for a time, and made a considerable sum of money in business before he returned. He went to Holland, again in 1645, and returned worth several thousand pounds, on which he entered the shipping business, meanwhile preaching the Gospel without charge.

The government made him an assessor of taxes for Middlesex, and he reached great influence in the community, although he had become a Baptist in 1638. When the controversy arose in Spilsbury's Church on the propriety of admitting unimmersed persons to preach, he established the Devonshire Square Church, 1640, and became its pastor. Soon after he was arrested and committed to prison. On a Sunday afternoon between sixty and seventy Baptists were met for worship, when six of them were arrested, brought before Parliament, admonished and discharged, and on the next Sunday four peers attended their worship, one of them probably being Lord Brooke, who favored dissenters. It is quite likely that this led Featley to challenge them to a disputation before Sir John Lenthall, the justice who brought them before the lords, and who called Featley's book, *Kiffin's Coffin*. Featley and Edwards, the author of 'Gangræna,' assailed him bitterly. Kiffin's wealth exposed him to wanton persecution, in which his foes expected fines or

bribes. In 1655 he was brought before the lord mayor at Guildhall, charged with preaching 'that the baptism of infants is unlawful,' and Monk afterward annoyed him greatly, by sending him to the guard at St. Paul's. His life was long, for he served the Devonshire Square Church over half a century; which spread through the reign of five monarchs, James I, the two Charles, James II and William III, besides the Protectorate of the two Cromwells. And it was full of trouble, for he was charged again and again with almost every conceivable plot against the government. Yet nothing was ever proved against him; and in 1701, he died at the age of 86, also full of honors. In sagacity, manners, godliness, labors and wisdom, he ranked as the leader of his denomination. Thurlow, Strype, Bumet and many others have honored his name with a high place in history, and Macaulay says of him: 'Great as was the authority of Bunyan with the Baptists, William Kiffin's was greater still.' The same may be said today of his molding influence upon American Baptists more than a century and two thirds after his death. Kiffin was the great champion of the Baptists in his day. Robert Pool, one of the sharpest Presbyterian controversialists of that period, made a savage attack upon the Baptists, and Kiffin came to their rescue in his reply, London, 1645. Pool demanded:

By what Scripture warrant Baptists separated from congregations where the Word and Sacraments were truly dispensed. Kiffin denied that they were so dispensed in the congregations from which they separated, otherwise they would be guilty of schism; then demanded: 'What Gospel institution have you for the baptizing of children, which was a pure invention of men and not an institution of Jesus Christ? When you have dispensed the word and power of Christ for the cutting off all drunkards, fornicators, covetous, swearers, liars, and all abominable and filthy persons, and

stand together in the faith, a pure lump of believers, gathered and united according to the institution of Christ; we, I hope, shall join with you in the same congregation and fellowship, and nothing shall separate us but death.' Pool asked on what Scripture authority they separated from other *Reformers* and framed new congregations of their own? Kiffin replied: That Baptist `churches existed before episcopacy, but Pool had withdrawn from Reformed Episcopacy. 'Where, as you tell us of a great work of reformation, we entreat you to show us wherein the greatness of it doth consist, for as yet we see no greatness unless it be in the vast expense of money and time. For what great thing is it to change Episcopacy into Presbytery, and a Book of Common Prayer into a Directory, and to exalt men from livings of £100 a year to places of £400 per annum? But where have they yet framed their State Church according to the pattern of Christ and his Apostles?' And when Pool pressed his point: On what Scripture ground the Baptists vindicated themselves from the sin of schism in defection from the Reformed Churches? Kiffin gave this home-thrust: The Presbyterians held that the baptism and ordination of Rome were valid, and that she was right in exacting tithes and state-pay, and yet held themselves guiltless of schism in leaving Rome. But when they shall return, 'as dutiful sons to their mother, we will return to you or hold ourselves bound to show just grounds to the contrary.'

At this time the Baptists of England generally distinguished themselves from the Pedobaptists as those of '*the baptized way*,' because they held that sprinkled folk were not baptized at all. But those of this '*way*' divided on the subject of communion, part of them being open communion, led by Bunyan, Jessey and others, while the great majority of them were strict in their communion. Kiffin led this wing of '*the baptized way*,' being followed by

Denny, Thomas Paul, Henry D'Anvers and others. The controversy was hot, and in his '*Right to Church Communion*,' Kiffin says in reply to Bunyan:

'If unbaptized persons may be admitted to all church privileges, does not such a practice plainly suppose that it [baptism] is unnecessary? For to what purpose is it to be baptized, may one reason with himself, if he may enjoy all church privileges without it? The Baptists, if once such a belief prevails, would be easily tempted to lay aside that reproached practice, which envious men have unjustly derided and aspersed, of being *dipt*, that is, baptized, and challenge their church communion by virtue of their faith only. And such as baptized infants would be satisfied to discontinue the practice when once they are persuaded that their children may be regular church members without it, for if it be superfluous, discreet and thrifty people would willingly be rid of the trouble of christening-feasts, as they call them, and all the appurtenances thereto belonging. So that in a short time we should have neither old nor young baptized, and by consequence, be in a like condition to lose one of the sacraments, which would easily make way for the loss of the other, both having an equal sanction in Scripture. And the arguments that disarmed the one would destroy the other, and consequently all ordinances, and modes of worship, and lastly religion itself.'

No morsel of reasoning in the English language has ever disposed of the essence of the Communion question so fully as this; and if his proposition had been intended as a prophecy concerning Bunyan's Church itself, it could not have been more strictly fulfilled to the letter, in that it now discards baptism entirely as necessary to the right of church fellowship.

HANSERD KNOLLYS was born in Lincolnshire, 1598, was educated at Cambridge and ordained in the Church of England by the Bishop of Peterborough. He was a thorough scholar, and published many works, amongst

which were grammars of the Greek, Latin and Hebrew languages. After holding a living at Humberstone, in Leicestershire; for three years, he resigned it on account of objections affecting the principles and practices of the Established Church.

In 1638 he left England to escape persecution, and arrived in New England, becoming pastor of a Church in Dover, then known as Piscataqua, New Hampshire. He returned to England in 1641, and became a very popular preacher in the various Churches of London. But one day, preaching in Bow Church, Cheapside, he spoke against infant baptism, which gave such offense that he was thrown into prison. On his release he went into Suffolk, where he was mobbed as an 'Anabaptist,' and after being stoned was sent to London on a warrant to answer to Parliament. Last of all he established a Baptist Church, meeting in Great St. Helen's, London, where he seldom preached to less than a thousand people. There, says Wilson, he gave great offense to his Presbyterian brethren, 'and the landlord was prevailed upon to warn him out of the place.' After this he preached to large congregations in Finsbury Fields, till he was 'summoned before a committee of divines in the Queen's Court, Westminster.' He had written a letter on the intolerance of the Presbyterian divines in London, to a friend in Norwich, which found its way to London and appeared against him. Again and again he was forbidden to preach, and as often he disregarded the charge and was pursued or imprisoned. At times he fled to Wales, Holland and Germany, to escape his foes. But his life was spared to the ripe age of ninety-three, and he preached the word in all parts of the kingdom; on Sundays generally delivering three or four sermons, and as many during the week, for a period of forty years. When in prison he had to content himself with one a day. Because of his great meekness and

learning he won many distinguished persons to Baptist views. Amongst these was Dr. De Veil, a foreign divine, of the Gallican Church, and professor of divinity in the University of Anjou. On abjuring Rome he fled to Holland first and then to London, where he became intimate with Bishops Stillingfleet, Compton Lloyd, Tillotson, Sharp and Patrick. While passing his Minor Prophets, Solomon's Song, Matthew and Mark, through the press, he found some Baptist writings in the library of Compton, the Bishop of London, the examination of which led him to seek the counsel of Knollys, and he united with the Baptists, to the great shock of the Bishops, all except Tillotson, who had been brought up a Baptist himself and knew how to value men of convictions. Knollys also immersed that great Oriental scholar, Henry Jessey, who spent his life upon a new translation of the Bible, a translation which, though not completed, was of great value to other scholars.

Those mentioned above were all Calvinistic Baptists, who were in a minority in and about London, but the General Baptists had men of equal piety, learning, and force of character amongst them. One of these was John Tombes, educated at Oxford, where he became a lecturer at the age of twenty-one. Leaving the university, he became famous as a Puritan preacher; and being satisfied at Oxford that infant baptism was an invention of men, his convictions were deepened at Bristol. In 1643 he went to London to consult the most famous of the Presbyterian divines assembled there; they rehearsed to him their stock arguments, and rejecting them as hollow, he was baptized upon a confession of Christ and became a Baptist pastor at Bewdly, near Kidderminster. He had severe controversies with Baxter and others on Baptist positions, and was pronounced by Baxter 'the most learned writer against infant baptism.' He wrote also more than a score of volumes on other subjects.

Although a Baptist, such was his scholarship and intellectual power that in 1653 Parliament appointed him one of the 'triers,' or commissioners, to examine and approve those who were to exercise the public ministry in the national Church. After the Restoration he left the ministry and conformed to the Church as a lay member, claiming the right to do so without altering his opinions, and that after he had kept poor Baxter's hands so full for many years.

HENRY DENNE was educated at Cambridge, and became a minister in the Established Church, about the year 1630. He was a stout Puritan, but his convictions led him to unite with the Baptists, and he was immersed into the fellowship of the Bell Alley Church, London, by Mr. Lamb, in 1643, and entered the Baptist ministry at once. He attained great fame as a disputant and as a 'very affectionate' preacher. He not only met Dr. Gunning in debate, but answered Featley's ridiculous book. Persecution followed him everywhere, and he suffered much for Christ, but planted many Churches, chiefly in the eastern counties. He was heroic in following his convictions of duty wherever they led him, and withal he entered Cromwell's army in obedience to the demands of his patriotism. There he served as a 'cornet,' or cavalry officer, meanwhile preaching to the soldiers; but mutinied with the twelve regiments in Oxfordshire, who demanded a free government, after the death of Charles. Some of his companions were punished with death, but he was pardoned. He wept bitterly when his life was spared, and afterward gave a history of the whole transaction. His death soon followed the Restoration and his memory was greatly honored.

HENRY JESSEY was a famous Baptist of those times. He was a Yorkshireman, educated at Cambridge and ordained in the Established Church in 1627. He refused to conform to all the Romish notions which Laud set up as the

standard of clerical orthodoxy. In 1637 he became pastor of the Independent Church which Henry Jacob had formed in 1616. From time to time members of this Church adopted Baptist views and separated from it, as we have seen in the cases of Spilsbury and Kiffin. These events turned his attention to the subject of infant baptism, which, after consultation with many leading Pedobaptist divines, he concluded was unscriptural, and in 1645 he was immersed by Knollys. He differed with the Confession of the Eight Churches on the question of communion, and published the first work known in England in favor of open communion. He was endowed with noble abilities and enriched with high Christian graces. After the Restoration he endured great persecution with holy fortitude, and died in prison in 1663. A letter of his informs us that one of the London Churches, meeting in Great Allhallows, received two hundred members by baptism between the years 1650-53; a fact which illustrates the rapid increase of Baptists not only in London and Kent, but also in the middle and northern counties.

The Fifth Monarchy men waxed bold and numerous during the latter years of the Commonwealth. It was but natural that the somber and fiery religious spirit of those times should betray ill-balanced intellects into fanaticism. New sects sprang up in a day and disappeared as quickly, and amongst them the Fifth Monarchy men. They were Premillenarians, with this modification of the chiliastic views which have been held by some in various ages, namely: they believed that Christ was about to come and begin his millennial reign at once, and that they were divinely commissioned to set up his kingdom on earth. A few of them were disposed to effect this revolution by the sword, but the greater part favored peaceful measures. A meeting was called in London for debate concerning 'the

laws, subjects, extent, rise, time, place, offices and officers of the Fifth Monarchy,' but probably the authorities suppressed it as mischievous, for it does not appear that it was held. The proposal to make it 'public' and to hear 'debate' indicate the pacific ideas of the leaders, and General Harrison was reported to be in sympathy with the movement, with a few other Baptists. But the Calvinistic Baptists were prompt to protest against the measure; they, with their brethren, the General Baptists, believing that the Prince of Peace will establish his kingdom without the sword. Just as the Protector's life was drawing to a close these misguided men chose Thomas Venner as their leader. He was a wine-cooper, and created an insurrection. He became nearly insane at the thought of monarchy restored in Charles II, and determined to destroy royalty as opposed to Christ. He rallied followers and armed them, adopted a banner on which was the lion of the tribe of Judah, with the motto, 'Who shall rouse him up?' and then proclaimed Jesus as King. The military were called out, and in a fight these men were slain or taken prisoners; Venner and fourteen others being hanged and quartered for treason. The fact that Venner and fifty men issued out of the Baptist meeting-house in Coleman Street has associated this mad proceeding with the General Baptists as a people, but very unjustly. Venner was not a Baptist; on the contrary, he threatened them that *if* he succeeded he would show them whether infant baptism were in the Bible, possibly as they had found it there so often, by the light of fagots. Mr. Lamb, the pastor of the Coleman

Street Church, at once united with the London Baptists in issuing a strong appeal to the world, showing that they were bound in conscience to render to Caesar his right, and had no sympathy with Venner's doings. This is clear enough from the fact that only fifty men issued out of the meeting-house with Venner, and yet Lamb's Church was 'by far the largest' Baptist Church in London. The British public believed the disclaimer of the Baptists, but not so the perfidious monarch; urged by his minister, Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, who hated the Baptists for their espousal of the Parliamentary cause, he made this insignificant piece of rant the pretext for a series of abuses upon the Independents, Quakers and Baptists, which will disgrace his name for ever. While some few Baptists believed in the doctrine of Christ's millennial reign, there is no satisfactory evidence that one of the fifty men were of their number, or that a single Baptist took part in the plot. Harrison was committed to the Tower for supposed complicity with it, but Garlyle, who studied this period with great thoroughness, gives it as his opinion that 'Harrison (was) hardly connected with the thing except as a well-wisher.' Froude sees the matter in much the same light, for he says: 'With the Fifth Monarchy men abroad, every chapel, except those of the Baptists, would have been a magazine of explosives. The Baptists and Quakers might have been trusted to discourage violence, but it was impossible to distinguish among the various sects.' [*Men of Letters*, Bunyan, p. 46]

Chapter 4 - British Baptists – John Bunyan

We must now look at the Baptists after the Restoration, the most noted of whom is JOHN BUNYAN. He was born at Elstow, near Bedford, in 1628, the famous year in which Charles I was forced to yield the Petition of Right. His education was next to nothing, yet he was favored above the boys of his village, for he attended the grammar school founded by Sir William Harper at Bedford; how long is not known, but at the best his educational attainments were quite scanty. Nature had given him a warm, light, frolicsome heart, which held him ready for any sort of glee and mischief, and under reversed circumstances subjected him not only to the pensive, but the desponding. He early feared God and longed to love him, but his giddiness and love of fun drew him into sin, until he became addicted to wrong-doing, principally lying and swearing. Because his father and himself were tinkers, and Gipsies in England have been tinkers from time immemorial, he was long supposed to be of this alien blood. But the records of his family are now traceable to about A.D. 1200, and the name itself, as then known, Buignon, indicates that the family was of Norman origin. This great descendant of that house was a man of intense feeling on all subjects. The religion of his times was of the most earnest nature, emotional, deep, almost fanatical, and when Bunyan's heart began to yearn after the Lord Jesus, his whole nature was inflamed. If we should take his own version of his case literally, he would compel us to believe that he was a sad scamp in youth and a desperate villain in early manhood. He tells us, however, that he was never drunk nor unchaste, and certainly he was never a thief nor a highwayman. He broke the Sabbath, loved dancing, ball-playing, bell-ringing and rough sports generally, and for these, with lying and profanity, his passionate self-accusings threw him into a deep and

terrible sense of guilt. His agonies and conflicts continued for months; he dreamed frightful dreams and saw alarming day visions, heard warning voices and read his doom written in letters of fire. Meanwhile, he was a soldier in the civil war, and at its close married a poor, but godly, orphan girl. Froude says that his marriage speaks much for his character, for 'had he been a dissolute, idle scamp, it is unlikely that a respectable woman would have become his wife when he was a mere boy.' At any rate, his soul-conflict not only continued, but deepened, until his sufferings became unbearable, and he concluded that he was too wicked to be saved and must be lost. One day, when walking alone in the country, a flood of light broke upon his mind with these words: 'He hath made peace through the blood of his cross;' when, he says: 'I saw that the justice of God and my sinful soul could embrace and kiss each other. I was ready to swoon, not with grief and trouble, but with solid joy and peace.' Soon after this, 1653, Mr. Gifford immersed him in the river Ouse, when he became a member of the Baptist Church at Bedford, as we shall see more fully in the next chapters; and in 1655 he entered the ministry of the Gospel.

Lord Macaulay speaks thus: 'The history of Bunyan is the history of a most excitable mind in an age of excitement.' While this consideration does not throw light upon the source and sweep of Bunyan's genius, it may and does suggest a weighty reason why it took the hue and channel that it selected for its expression, both in his personal history and in the sixty works of his pen. The sixty years of his natural life ran through a long list of the most remarkable events of the English annals. In his day the High Commission and the Star Chamber brought before his mind the most vital question of human rights. This Court was empowered on mere suspicion to administer an

oath, by which the prisoner was bound to reveal his inward thoughts, opinions and convictions, and thus accuse himself on pain of death. Every day filled Bunyan's ears with some new, romantic and blood-stirring event. He held his breath and turned pale when he heard that Charles lost not only his crown but his head as a traitor, when Cromwell drew the sword for British liberties and progress, when Cavaliers and Roundheads flew in every direction, when the Commonwealth was nourished with the blood of his brethren, and when Naseby, Edgewood and Marston Moor decreed, that no irresponsible tyrant should ever mount the throne again. He was familiar with the mad plots of Oates, Dangerfield and Venner, with the Conventicle Act, the ejection of two thousand men of God from the pulpits in a day, the faithlessness of the second Charles, the hypocrisies of James, the Butcheries of Claverhouse, the infamous mockery of justice in Jeffreys, and the fall of the perfidious Stuarts. The smoke of burning martyrs filled the air over his head, and he saw the blows for freedom which were struck by Hampden and Pym, Sidney and Russell. Howard, the great philanthropist, a hundred years afterward, walked the same streets and country roads that Bunyan trod, and, it is said, caught his spirit of prison reform largely from the 'Den' in which Bunyan had lain. The great singers of his day were Herbert and Milton, Dryden and Shakespeare. And the mighty preachers were Howe and Henry, Charnock and Owen, Tillotson and South, Sherlock and Stillingfleet. Bunyan's observation was keen and extensive; he lived in the very heart of England, was an actor in some of its most exciting scenes, and it is impossible but that the spirit of the times moved him at every step. In his day, English literature had become thoroughly imbued with all the elements of poetry and fiction; nay, even of romance. These had come down through

high Italian authorship. Not only had the colloquial English descended through Wycliffe, and its higher literature through Chaucer, but they had been largely blended in the Bible, with which Bunyan was most familiar; so that simple, idiomatic Saxon English was prepared to his hand; being full of image and awe, of wonder and grandeur, which he could express to the popular mind in a very racy style. Unconsciously he felt the force of his mother-tongue; it stimulated his genius, became the groundwork of his thought and the model of his utterance; a choice which places him side by side with Shakespeare and the English Bible, as one of the great conservators of our powerful language.

In a burst of unreasoning loyalty the English people, in 1660, placed Charles II on the throne, without exacting proper guarantees for that liberty which they had bought with their own blood. He had given his word on honor to protect all his subjects in their religious freedom; and then, like a true Stuart, he sold that honor to his lust of power. Hardly was he seated on the throne when Venner's petty insurrection furnished a pretext for vengeance upon all his opponents, and especially those in the dissenting sects, no matter how much they proved their loyalty. Amongst the first victims of his tyranny we find Bunyan, charged with 'devilishly' and 'perniciously' abstaining from going to church, 'as a common upholder of meetings contrary to the laws of the king,' and with 'teaching men to worship contrary to law.' He was sentenced to Bedford jail for three months, and at the end of that time to be transported if he refused to conform. But his judges kept him in prison for six years: and when released he instantly began to preach again, whereupon he was imprisoned for another six years. Being released still again, he began to preach at once, and was arrested for the third time, but was detained only a few

months. His judges were harsh with him, but his real oppressors for these twelve weary years were the king and Parliament, who made it a crime for any one to preach but a priest of the Church of England. It was long supposed that he was imprisoned mostly in the town jail of Bedford, on the bridge over the river Ouse, but it is now clear that his long imprisonment was in the county jail, where his anonymous biographer of 1700 says, that he heard him preach to sixty dissenters and three ministers. There is good ground for believing, however, that he passed a considerable period in the jail on the bridge, and that he wrote his *Pilgrim's Progress* there.

While we are obliged to reprehend the base injustice which kept this grand preacher pining in a prison, however leniently treated, the fact is forced upon us, that the wrath of man was made to praise God; for had not his zealous servant been compelled to this solitude, we should not have had that masterpiece of literature. His 'Holy War' and other productions would have brought down to us a literary name for him of no mean order, but his 'Pilgrim' is a book for all people and all time. Bunyan's great power is in allegory and this form of it is unique, because its facts and dress are not fantastic, but are inherent in man's common sense and moral nature. His 'Pilgrim' is full of truth – this he drew from the Bible; of history, which he took from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*; of terse English, which he learned from Spenser and Chaucer; of human nature, which he borrowed from himself and his circumstances; of hallowed conviction, which he caught from the Holy Spirit; and of uncrippled boldness, which was inspired by his love of soul-liberty. In earlier times some treated this great book with sneer and scorn, but in later days the first critics have vied with each other to exhaust upon it the language of eulogy. Dr. Johnson, Coleridge, Arnold, Macaulay and Froude have

pronounced it equally fit for the plowman and the philosopher, the peer and the peasant; and the Queen of England thinks 'Christian,' its great character, a pattern for her grandchildren to copy in the palace. The glorious truth which made the heart of Bunyan beat quicker under the tinker's doublet has since given 'heart's-ease' to many a throbbing bosom which heaves under the purple. And the humbler walks of life, from old age to childhood, have made it next to the Bible, the story of their lives. In all souls it has created visions, interpreted dreams, and awakened 'the joy that made me write.' The eight editions through which it passed in thirty years gave but small promise of the progress of its pilgrimage since. No book has been rendered into so many languages, except the word of God itself. To many who are now 'high in bliss upon the bliss of God,' it first set 'the joy-bells ringing in the city of habitation.' The pauper and beggar of London have read it in thoroughfares and squares, and threaded their way by its guidance through Vanity Fair. The Italian has crouched beneath the shade of the Vatican, and trembled to look up lest he should see Giant Pope. The dusky Burman has taken it into the deep jungle, to show him stepping-stones through the Slough of Despond. The darker African has stolen with it into a by-path of the wild woods, and, under the palm-tree, has dreamed of the white man's heaven. The son of Abraham and the daughter of Jerusalem have read its pages to the sigh of the wind amongst the olives and the ripple of Kedron; and the Hindoo, with Bunyan in his hand, has resolved on courage when he crossed the 'deep river;' for angels, such as do not wait upon the banks of his sacred Ganges, beckon him over.

No wonder that when Mr. Brown, the minister of Bunyan's meeting, lately visited Scotland, a worthy Highlander was startled when introduced to him as 'Bunyan's successor.' Starting back and measuring him from head to

foot, he exclaimed: 'Eh, mon! but ye'll ha hard work to fill *his shoon!*' Dean Stanley says: 'When in early life I lighted on the passage where the Pilgrim is taken into the House Beautiful to see "the pedigree of the Ancient of Days, and the varieties and histories of that place, both ancient and modern," I determined that if ever the time should arrive when I should become a professor of ecclesiastical history, these should become the opening words in which I would describe the treasures of that magnificent store-house. Accordingly, when, many years after, it so fell out, I could find no better mode of beginning my course at Oxford than by redeeming that early pledge; and when the course came to an end, and I wished to draw a picture of the prospects still reserved for the future of Christendom, I found again that the best words I could supply were those in which, on leaving the Beautiful House, Christian was shown in the distance the view of the Delectable Mountains, "which they said, would add to his comfort because they were nearer to the desired haven"' This was a worthy and heart-felt tribute from Westminster to the dreaming tinker whose effigy now adorns the House of Commons, side by side with those of orators, heroes and statesmen in honor of the man, who, though he 'devilishly' abstained from attending the church 'contrary to the laws of the king,' has preached in all pulpits and palaces ever since.

After Bunyan's final release from prison in 1672, he became pastor of the Church at Bedford, and so threw his life into Gospel labor, that his fame as a preacher increased until he was, perhaps, the most famous minister of his day. The few sermons which have come down to us, show that he spoke as he wrote. As in his *Pilgrim* he embodies more of the Bible than does Milton in his *Paradise Lost*, so in his sermons we find more true human nature than in Shakespeare. His sentences burn with sacred

touches of divine experience and move us with sympathy, so that they must have melted his bearers to tears. They also abound in personification and figure, touched by a little quiet but keen satire, and are rich in reality, tenderness and life. So great was his success as a preacher, that the largest buildings to which he had access in London would not contain the multitudes who flocked to hear him. One of his early biographers says: 'I have seen about twelve hundred at a morning lecture, by seven o'clock, on a working day, in the dark winter time. I have computed about three thousand that came to hear him one Lord's-day at the town's-end meeting-house, so that half were fain to go back again for want of room, and then himself was fain, at a back door, to be pulled almost over people to get up stairs to his pulpit.' John Owen heard him preach, probably at Zoar Chapel, and when King Charles expressed wonder that a man of his learning could bear to listen to the 'prate' of a tinker, he answered, that he would gladly give all his learning for this tinker's power. In the doctrinal controversies of the times, he gave and took many a hard blow, but his writings leave slight traces of personal bitterness toward his opponents. Indeed, hard feeling seems to have been a stranger both in him and his house. His wife was gentle to a proverb. When he was in prison she went to London to pray for his release, and induced a peer of the realm to present a petition to the House of Lords in his behalf; so the judges were directed to look into the matter afresh. She, therefore, appeared before Sir Matthew Hale, Chester and Twisden. With all the simplicity of a woman's love she told her artless story. She said that her husband 'was a peaceable person,' and wished to support his family. They had four helpless children, one of them blind, and while he was in prison they must live on charity. Hale treated her kindly, Twisden harshly, and demanded whether he

would leave off preaching if released. In child-like honesty she replied, that 'he dare not leave off preaching so long as he could speak.' Her request was denied and she left the Court in tears, not so much, she said, 'because they were so hard-hearted against me and my husband, but to think what a sad account such poor creatures would have to give at the coming of the Lord.' Jesus wept because Jerusalem stoned the prophets, and Bunyan's wife was much like him. But, this giant in genius was just as tender-hearted as his wife. Where do we find such pathos in any passage as this, which he wrote in prison:

'The parting with my wife and poor children hath often been to me in this place as the pulling off my flesh from my bones; and that not only because I am too, too fond of those great mercies, but also because I should have often brought to my mind the hardships, miseries and wants my poor family was like to meet with should I be taken from them; especially my poor blind child, who lay nearer my heart than all I had besides. Poor child, thought I, what sorrow art thou like to have for thy portion in this world! Thou must be beaten, suffer hunger, cold, nakedness and a thousand calamities, though I cannot now endure the wind should blow on thee. But yet, thought I, I must venture all with God, though it goeth to the quick to leave you. I was as a man who was pulling down his house upon the head of his wife and children. Yet; thought I, I must do it, I must do it.'

So loving was Bunyan's disposition, that he kept the heart of the jailer soft all the time. He not only allowed him to visit his church frequently, unattended, and to preach the Gospel, too; but his blind Mary constantly visited him, with such little gifts as she could gather for his solace. She had great concern for him, lest he sorrowed beyond all hope, and often when parting with him, would put her delicate fingers to his eyes and cheeks, to feel if the tears flowed that she might kiss them away.

His blind babe died and left him in prison; with O, how many fatherly benedictions upon her sweet memory. It was meet that little, blind Mary Bunyan should enter the Celestial Gate before the hero of the 'DEN,' a true 'shining one' to watch and wait for his coming. Nor did she wait long. In 1688 he went to London to reconcile an alienated father and son, and succeeded. But on the journey a violent storm overtook him, and he contracted a fatal illness which after ten days took him to Jesus, the King in his beauty, and to blind Mary, when he first saw her sweet eyes blaze with light. She raised not a hand to his cheek then, as was her old wont in Bedford, for God had wiped away all tears from his eyes; and since then the old and young pilgrim have dwelt together in the golden city.

Bunyan died just as the day dawned on England when the second great Revolution was to make her a free nation, in which Baptists could breathe freely. Mr. Froude couples him thus with them, in his biography of Bunyan: 'In the language of the time, he became convinced of sin and joined the Baptists, the most thorough-going and consistent of all the Protestant sects. If the sacrament of baptism is not a magical form, but is a personal act in which the baptized person devotes himself to Christ's service, to baptize children at any age when they cannot understand what they are doing may seem irrational and even impious.' [Froude's *English Men of Letters*] Bunyan's ashes rest in Bunhill Fields, marked by a neat tomb, bearing simply his name. But in 1874 the Duke of Bedford, a descendant of Lord William Russell, the martyr to liberty, presented a most costly and beautiful statue to that city, in Bunyan's memory. The 10th of June in that year was one of the greatest days that Bedford ever knew. The corporation, with many thousands of distinguished persons from all parts of the Kingdom, assembled on St. Peter's green, to

unveil this work of art. This was done by Lady Augusta Stanley, sister of the Earl of Elgin and wife of the Dean of Westminster. Although Bunyan's back is still turned toward St. Peter's Church, the bells rang a merry peal, and immense crowds assembled in the Corn Exchange and on the green, to listen to addresses from the Mayor, Dean Stanley, Earl Cowper and many others of great note; and a banquet at the Swan Hotel crowned the day. As was fitting, 4,000 Sunday-school children of Bedford and Elstow consumed a ton and a quarter of cake and six hundred gallons of tea, in honor of the occasion; and with bands of music made a pilgrimage to Elstow, the birthplace of their enchanting dreamer; and the press of the United Kingdom that day called Bunyan blessed. The statue is of bronze, cast of cannon and bells brought from China, weighing two and a half tons. The figure of Bunyan is taken from a painting by Sadler, and is ten feet high. The idea which Boehm, the sculptor, has striven to give, is expressed in an inscription on the pedestal, and is taken from the picture of 'a very grave person.' which Bunyan saw hung in the Interpreter's house:

'It had eyes uplifted to heaven;
The best of books in his hand;
The law of truth was written
Upon his lips...
It stood as if it pleaded
With men.'

A broken fetter at his feet represents his long imprisonment, and on a tablet beneath is a facsimile of his autograph in his will, 'John Bunyan.' Three sides of the pedestal contain scenes from '*Pilgrim's Progress*,' in, bold relief: Evangelist pointing Christian to the wicket gate; Christian's fight with Apollyon; Pilgrim released from his load and the three shining ones pointing him to the Celestial City. The monument stands where four roads meet, but,

like its original, it only faces one way and is full of repose, the ideal of that lofty spirituality, which claims the right to look to heaven without a license from the established Church.

Bunyan's figure is thus described: 'He was tall of stature, strong-browed, with sparkling eyes, wearing his hair on his upper lip after the old British fashion; his hair reddish, but in his latter days sprinkled with gray; his nose well cut, his mouth moderately large, his forehead something high, and his habit always plain and modest.'

That Bunyan was an open communion Baptist has never been seriously doubted until the recent publication of his life, by Rev. John Brown, A.M., minister of the Bunyan meeting at Bedford. This work throws new light on many points in his history and is ably written, but because of certain parish records which it publishes, and which seem to imply that Bunyan's children were christened, after he had united with the Bedford Church, it is needful to examine that subject candidly and carefully. Whether Mr. Brown intended to convey this impression or not, his book is well adapted to place Bunyan's practice in direct contradiction with many of his own utterances, and to render his conduct irreconcilable with the universal testimony of history as to his union with the Baptists. Yet Mr. Brown carefully avoids saying that he was not a Baptist. He quotes Bunyan's words: 'Do not have too much company with some Anabaptists, *though I go under that name myself*,' and then adds: 'This is plain enough. The only difficulty is how to reconcile his practice with his declaration; for he seems to have had three of his children baptized at church in their infancy, as we gather from the register of the parishes of Elstow and St. Cuthbert's.' These words cannot be misunderstood, and their sense is re-affirmed thus: 'There can be little doubt, therefore, that the year after John Bunyan joined the Bedford

brotherhood his second daughter, like his first, was baptized at Elstow Church. The third case, that of his son Joseph, is the most remarkable of all, for this child, according to the register, was baptized at St. Cuthbert's Church after Bunyan's twelve years' imprisonment for conscience' sake, and during the time he was conducting the controversy on open communion with D'Anvers and Paul. The fact is curious, and can only be accounted for on the supposition that upon the question of baptism he had no very strong feeling any way.' [Brown's *Life of Bunyan*, pp. 238,239]

On this question and others growing out of it, the writer opened a respectful correspondence with Mr. Brown, to which he responded in that manner and spirit which always prompt the high-minded investigator. Under date of May 1st, 1886, Mr. Brown writes concerning Bunyan's own baptism: 'There is no evidence that Bunyan was not immersed. Looking at what he says of himself (*vide my 'life of Bunyan,' p. 238, line 6*), I should say he was immersed though there is no record of the fact.' These quotations are sufficient to show that Mr. Brown is not to be considered as saying that Bunyan was not a Baptist, but simply that he could not reconcile his position as a Baptist with the christening of his children. Before examining these records it may be a favor to the American reader, who is not familiar with the vicinity of Bedford in England, to say, that Elstow, Bunyan's birthplace, is a village about a mile and a half from Bedford, and that he continued to reside there probably till about A.D. 1685-56, when he removed to Bedford. At that time this town numbered less than 2,000 inhabitants, and for ecclesiastical purposes, was then and is now divided into four parishes, known respectively as St. John's, St. Peter's, St. Paul's and St. Cuthbert's. The first record to be examined is that of Elstow, which reads thus:

Elstow: 'Mary, the daughter of John Bonion, baptized July 20th, 1650.'

As Bunyan did not unite with Gifford's Church till 1653, three years after this record was made, it has no bearing on the question whether he was a Baptist or not. When Mary was christened, he was, as he tells us himself, leading a wicked life, having no church connection aside from a nominal one in the Church of England. It may, therefore, be dismissed with the remark, that as it leaves nothing to 'reconcile' in his practice, it needs no further consideration. The second entry was made at Elstow, the year after his union with Gifford's Church, and reads as follows: 'Elizabeth, the daughter of John Bonyon, was borne 14th day of April, 1654.' Taking all things into the account and in the order of their dates, with a full knowledge of the circumstances of the case, we shall find this record Bunyan's second public protest against infant baptism, which he pronounced an infirmity of the weak. In his controversy with his strict communion brethren, they charged him with indulging Baptists, in disobedience to the requirements of truth, when he communed with those who had never been baptized upon their faith in Christ. To this he replied: 'But what acts of disobedience do we indulge in? "In the *sin* of infant baptism?" We indulge them not, but being commanded to bear with the infirmities of the weak, suffer it; *it being in our eyes such*, but in theirs, they say, a duty, till God persuade them.' [*Works*, I, p. 450] It matters not at this point whether, when Bunyan went with Gifford into the river Ouse, he was immersed or not, though Mr. Brown, judging by what Banyan writes, '*though I go under that name myself*' ('Anabaptist'), says, 'I should say he was immersed.' This much, however, is clear, that whatever was done to Bunyan in the Ouse, he did there publicly repudiate his own infant baptism. Mr. Brown tells us (page 36)

that he finds John Bunyan's name 'in the list of nineteen christenings at Elstow Church in the following form: "1628. John the sonne of Thomas Bounionn, Junr. the 30th of Novemb.'" But as Bunyan could not go under the name of 'Anabaptist' on that christening, it follows that when he went with Gifford into the river he deliberately repudiated the infant baptism which his father had imposed upon him in 1628, in the discharge of what he regarded as his parental 'duty,' as a member of the Church of England. It remains to be seen whether or not, a year after this repudiation, he fell into what he calls the weakness of infant baptism, and which he said was such in his eyes, by taking his own daughter to that same Church of England to christen her, in 'duty, till God persuaded' him otherwise. This, of course, would imply that he recalled his protest against his own infant baptism made a year earlier, and in turn repudiated his believer's baptism, after he had solemnly taken it upon himself as an 'Anabaptist.' This conduct would show any thing but that he had no strong feeling on the question of baptism, for with his very tender conscience he must have had terrible feelings on the subject, if he backed and filled in that way. No; this entry evinces the deepest feeling on the question of infant baptism and is his second public protest against its practice, the first being in himself by his own baptism as a believer, the second in his beloved daughter and her simple birth record.

The difference between these two entries, the baptismal record of Mary and the birth record of Elizabeth, shows that between the years 1650 and 1654 a well-defined change had taken place in their father's mind on the subject of christening. Had he chosen he could have had Elizabeth christened and her christening entered in the same form as that of Mary but he chose not to do that; and limiting the record to her birth, it simply says that Elizabeth was

'borne' on the 14th day of April, 1654. The following facts throw a flood of light upon this record, as they prove, that in 1645 Parliament put the recording of births into the hands of the clergy, that in 1653 this registration was taken out of their hands, and that under William and Mary it was restored to them again, and all this for the best of reasons.

1. In 1645 Parliament had banished the use of the Prayer-book in every place of worship in England and Wales, and had substituted a form of worship called the Directory. This law required all Prayer-books to be given up, and fined any who used one in any place of worship, church or chapel, £5 for the first offense, £10 for the second, 'and for the third offense one whole year's imprisonment without bail or mainprise.' It had also enacted, that

'There shall be provided at the charge of every parish or chapelry in the realm of England and dominion of Wales, a fair register book of vellum, to be kept by the *minister* and officers of the church, and that the names of all children baptized, and of their parents and of the time of their birth *and baptizing*, shall be written and set down by the minister therein.'

This act provided for the registration of *both* births and baptisms, and was careful not to confound the two as one. [Act. 1645, chap. 57. Acts and Ordinances of Parliament, 1640-56]

2. Down to A.D. 1653, the year in which Bunyan united with Grifford's Church, Quakers, Baptists and all who rejected infant baptism, were subjected to every sort of annoyance for neglecting to go to the recording clergy as thus required, to have their children christened and a record of their birth *and* baptism made in the 'book of vellum' at the parish church, the Church of England. The same was true also of their marriages and burials.

3. Having in view their relief, not only in

the matter of baptism, but also in that of marriages and burials, Cromwell's short Parliament took this whole matter out of the hands of the clergy, making marriage a purely secular act, stripping birth, marriage and burial of subjection to all ecclesiastical usages, and put the entire keeping of the parish records into secular hands for civil purposes alone. Of course, Baptists, Quakers and all other such subjects loyal to the civil power were delighted to be freed from ecclesiastical contempt in this way, and to comply with a mere civil provision, which in no way conflicted with their convictions of right; and they cheerfully complied with a law which simply required them to record the birth of their children as in duty to the State.

4. It is of this Act that Gobbet speaks in his *Parliamentary History*, under date of August 25th, 1653. He writes: 'Great part of this month had been taken up in canvassing a bill concerning marriages and the registering thereof, and also of *births* and burials. This day it passed the house on this question, and was ordered to be printed and published. This extraordinary Act entirely took marriages out of the hands of the clergy, and put them into those of the Justices of the Peace.' [Vol. iii, (1642-1660), p. 1414]

The writer has carefully examined this Act and would copy it entire, but as it covers many folios it is too long. It is found in the

'Acts and Ordinances of Parliament, examined by the original record and printed by special order of Parliament, by Henry Hills and John Field, printers to his Highness the Lord Protector, 1658; by Henry Scobell, the clerk of Parliament.'

For some reason, the Acts of the Commonwealth are not printed with the continuous laws of the realm, but are put in this special collection by themselves, and at the risk

of a little tediousness, as this book is very scarce, a brief analysis of the Act may here be given. It directs 'how marriages shall be solemnized and registered, as also a register for births and burials,' but says nothing of baptisms. It was extended to Ireland 'from and after December 1st, 1653.' It specially provides for the election of a Registrar by popular suffrage in the parish thus:

I. 'The Inhabitants and Householders of every Parish chargeable to the relief of the poor, or the greater part of them present, shall on or before the 22d day of September, 1653, make choice of some able and honest person (such as shall be sworn and approved by one Justice of the Peace in that Parish, Division or County, and so signified under his hand in the said Register-book), to have the keeping of said book, who shall therein fully enter in writing all such Publications, Marriages, *Births* of children and Burials of all sorts of persons, and the names of every of them, and the days of the month and year of Publications, Marriages, Births and Burials. And the Register in each Parish shall attend the said Justice of the Peace to subscribe the entry of each such Marriage; and the person so selected, approved and sworn, shall be called the Parish-Register and shall continue three years in such place of Register.'

II. This Act further provides, that 'All Register-books for Marriages, Births and Burials shall be delivered into the hands of the respective Registers appointed by this Act to be kept as Records.' Thus the clergy were not only stripped of the recorder's office, but the old books of register made previous to 1653 were taken out of their custody and put into secular hands: 'Any law, statute, custom or usage to the contrary notwithstanding,' as the Act states.

III. The use of the Prayer-book and all religious services at marriages and burials was done away with, and as the Act knew nothing of christenings, of course, the registration of births called for no provision against such services. The parties to be married were to choose whether the Register should publish

their intended marriage three Sundays in the church or chapel, or in the market-place next to the said church or chapel, on three market-days in the three several weeks next following.' On the day of marriage, in the presence of the Justice, the man was to take the woman by the hand and distinctly pronounce the following words: 'I, A.B., do here in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, C.D, for my wedded wife. I do, also, in the presence of God and before these witnesses, promise to be unto thee a loving and faithful husband.' When the woman had gone through the same form, the Justice declared them husband and wife. The Act then strips the clergy of all power to marry in these sweeping words:

'From and after such consent so expressed and such declaration made, the same, as to the form of marriage, shall be good and effectual in law. *And no other marriage whatever within the Commonwealth of England, after the twenty-ninth of September, shall be held or accounted a marriage according to the laws of England.*'

IV. The Act made a number of curious minor provisions which may be named, simply for the gratification of the reader, such as these:

The 'fee for Publications and certificates thereof 1s.; for marriages 1s.' 'From those who live upon alms nothing shall be taken.' The Justice 'in case of dumb persons may dispense with pronouncing the words; and with joining hands in case of persons that have no hands.' After the 29th of Sep. 1653, the age of a man to consent to marriage shall be sixteen years, and the age of the woman fourteen years.' All disputes as to the lawfulness of marriage were referred to Justices at the Quarter Sessions.

Under the well-settled rule in law, that the legislative intent can best be readied by examining all Acts on the same subject-matter and weighing them together, these Acts have been here presented, and so we cannot miss the intent of this particular Act of 1653. As the Act of 1645 had expressly put registration of births and baptisms into the hands of the clergy, and

the Act of 1653 had put the registration of births into secular hands and said nothing about records for baptism or christening, taking all public registration out of clerical hands, the entry of baptisms was legally dropped from the public records, under the provisions of the last Act. That this was both the intention and practice under that law is more clearly seen in the further fact, that Acts VI and VII under William and Mary restored registration to the clergy, and made special provision for the record of christenings by those in Holy Orders. This legislation was known as

'An Act for granting his Majesty certain rates and duties upon Marriages, Births and Burials, and upon Batchelors and Widowers, for the term of five years, for carrying on the war against France with vigor.' This Act once more made it the duty of those in Holy Orders: 'Deans, Parsons, Deacons, Vicars, Curates,' to keep 'a true and exact register in writing of all and every person or persons married, buried, *christened or born* in their respective parishes or precincts.'

These Acts taken together show how thoroughly discriminating and secularizing the Act of August 25th, 1653, was intended to be, and what a radical change it made both in the public practices and their records. Of course, it aroused the wrath of the State clergy to the hottest indignation. They treated it with every form of contempt which they could devise. When the Directory had pushed the Prayer-book out of use, many hundreds of them, some say thousands, either resigned their livings or were ejected for setting the law at defiance. It absolutely forbade them to use the Prayer-book for the burial of the dead, as well as in their churches. It enjoined that,

'When any person departed this life, let the dead body upon the day of burial be decently attended from the house to the place appointed for public burial, and then interred

Chapter 4 - British Baptists – John Bunyan

without any ceremony For that praying, reading and singing, both in going to and at the grave, have been grossly abused, and are no more beneficial to the dead and have proved hurtful to the living; therefore, let all such things be laid aside.'

Surely, this was all that the clerical flesh and blood of that day could bear. But now, to follow up that revolution with another, which eight years later not only took marriage entirely out of their hands, but denied them the right to record the births which honored those secular marriages, was unendurable to them. If any body wanted them to christen their infants, the law did not forbid their doing so, in the exercise of their religious rights. But the law would not have their christenings entered on the public records as acts of any civil interest or concern. Then, the way in which their former prerogatives were taken from them, was more exasperating still. The new Registrars were to be selected by the popular vote of their own parishioners, over whom they had so unconscionably domineered, and that without regard to the religion of either candidate or voter. Besides, his record of the marriages entered was to be purely secular and to be attested before a Justice of the Peace and not by a priest. And, worse than all, in the eyes of the priest, this Act of August 25th, 1653, left all who rejected the superstition of christening at liberty to enjoy the full rights of Englishmen by recording the 'birth' of their children, and of securing to them all the legal advantages which such a civil entry secured in property rights and courts of justice, without compromising their principles by a forced submission to infant baptism. Their children could now prove their lineage and derive all the political rights which such entry entitled them to while they lived, and when they died they could be buried decently in ground either 'consecrated' or unconsecrated without anyhow consulting the

whimsical dictations of an arrogant priesthood. Such a state of things would suit Bunyan's ideas of liberty exactly.

Such a right had never been enjoyed by dissenting Englishmen before, and Cobbet well characterizes the Act as 'extraordinary.' Its passage was stubbornly resisted as a bold innovation; and he says that it held Parliament to discussion for a great part of the entire month, which 'canvassing' must have stirred the feeling of the entire realm. Especially must all Baptists and Quakers have been interested, as it took their marriages and burials out of the hands of an oppressive and offensive clergy, and left them at liberty to record the '*birth*' of their children and to stop there, as far as christening was concerned; so that they now stood before the law on an equality with their neighbors, free from all ecclesiastical proscription because they refused to have their children baptized. With this legal shield thrown over his head, we can easily understand why honest John Bunyan, who spoke so freely in his writings against infant baptism, as we shall see, felt it his duty as an English freeman to obey the law by entering the '*birth*' of his babe on the public records, when English law at last stepped forth sacredly to guard the rights of his conscience while discharging his duty as a citizen. Thus the entry of his child's '*birth*' without any entry of her christening stands to the end of time on the Elstow parish Register with the force of his public protest against the superstition of infant baptism enforced by the State. Then was Elizabeth Bunyan christened as a matter of fact? Certainly not. Mr. Brown quotes the entry in the Elstow parish Register and concedes that it certifies only to her birth. He also refers to the law of 1653 in the following words:

'It will be pointed out, perhaps, that the register notes that Elizabeth Bunyan was *born*

Baptists of Great Britain

on the 14th day of April, and says nothing about her baptism. But it must be remembered that the previous year an Act of Parliament had been passed requiring the date of birth to be inserted in the register instead of that of baptism.'

It is a matter of some surprise that the learned biographer has cited this Act in support of his theory. According to his idea, the object of Parliament in passing it was merely to change the form of words to be entered on the register. Upon analysis it is apparent that his claim must be that, although the record says *born*, she was in reality *christened* on that day, and that the fact was misstated in order that the law might be technically complied with. The improbability of this supposition is clear from its simple statement, and it, moreover, betrays an entire misconception of the purpose of the statute. It was not enacted simply to alter the verbal formulary used in the records, but to entirely secularize the department of vital statistics, and to allow marriages and births to be publicly recorded, though the clergy had not solemnized the nuptials or christened the children or buried the dead.

Mr. Brown in furtherance of his argument proceeds as follows:

'To show further that this Act of 1653 sufficiently accounts for the form of entry in 1654, it may be mentioned that in the Transcript Register from Elstow parish that year the name of Elizabeth Bunyan occurs in a list of twenty-three children, all returned under the head of "Christenings," and that the word "borne" and not "baptized" is used in every case.'

Of course, the writer, on this side of the Atlantic, not being able to inspect and compare these documents must rely on an inspection and comparison made by others. Hence he requested a gentleman of known accuracy in the employ of Her Majesty's government to

examine both the original and the transcript registers. He writes July 29th, 1886:

'In the Parish Register at Elstow for April 14th, 1654, I find Elizabeth Bunyan recorded as "*borne*" without any mention of her christening. In all the entries down to the year 1662 each child is so entered. After 1662 the word "Christened" is substituted and the word "*borne*" drops out. The Register is without headings, only the year and day of the month are entered, then the entries follow to the end of the year, when the same process is repeated. In the archives of the Archdeanery at Bedford, I find the Transcript Registers, and they give Elizabeth Bunyan, daughter of John, as "christened" April 14th, 1654. This stands along with 23 others, total 24. From that date the word "*borne*" does not occur again. Then as to the headings: as I said, the Elstow Register is without headings, and this order is continued in the Transcripts, which for the whole ten years are not only *without headings* but *without signatures*. I had omitted to count the number of entries at Elstow for 1653-54, and was obliged to write the vicar for the information which he kindly supplied in the enclosed letter:

"'Bedford, July 26th, 1886: Dear Sir: You ask how many were entered on the Register as "*borne*" during the years 1653 and 1654. In the former year only six were entered as born and in the latter twenty-four. The discrepancy between the original Register and the Transcript is curious. The Canons of 1604 ordered that copies of the Register should be sent annually to the Registry of the Diocese. I suspect this was discontinued during the Commonwealth, and that copies were not made again until after the time of the Restoration, when christenings were inserted and not births. Yours faithfully. James Copner.'"

The discrepancy referred to by Mr. Copner (whose own valuable work of Bunyan is elsewhere cited in these pages) is simply that of the use of '*borne*' in the original and '*christened*' in the transcript. Otherwise it appears that the documents correspond. The investigation

reduces itself to the inquiry, which shall be believed, the original register which says that Elizabeth was born on April 14th, 1654, or the transcript which states that she was christened on that day? It is to the last degree improbable that she was both born and christened on the same day, and therefore both records cannot be true. Born in her father's house on the 14th of April, even if he had wished her christened, she could not be taken to the parish church on the day of her birth. But if she was christened on the 14th of April and born at some other time, then the original entry is made a piece of confusion. It was never the custom of the English, or even of the Romish Church, to christen children on the very day of their birth, unless it was feared that the child would die immediately after coming into the world, and so its body was sprinkled to save its soul. Furthermore, it is not claimed that these transcript registers were independent records of facts outside of those contained in the originals. The transcripts were annual copies of the Parish Register sent up on parchment to the Archdeacon by the vicar or rector of the parish in compliance with the canons of 1603. They gave the names of all persons married, baptized, or buried the previous year copied from the Register, and forwarded each Easter. This was to provide for the existence of a duplicate copy in case the parish register should be lost. The transcripts, therefore, always purported to be exact copies of the originals and, in case of discrepancy, the originals would of course govern. We are thus brought to the question, which is entitled to credence: a public record kept and prepared under direction of the law of the land, with prescribed formalities by a duly elected civil officer, or the inconsistent statement contained in an extra-official document, without date or signature, which purports to be a copy of the original and is not a true copy thereof? Here again the mere

statement of the proposition makes only one answer possible. It is a trite rule of the law that, for the purpose of evidence, a copy is not allowable in the presence of the original, and it is not easy to see why Mr. Brown should have brought in a professed copy with the original, especially as the original says one thing and the so-called copy another. In a letter dated May 21st, 1886, he says:

'This Transcript for 1654 is at Bedford in the Archives of the Archdeanery along with those from all the parishes of Bedfordshire. Those for the Commonwealth Period were sent up for the whole ten years at once [1650-1660] after the Restoration by the vicar, Christopher Hall, and are complete.'

It is difficult to imagine any motive for the continuation of the custom of sending an annual transcript during the Commonwealth. The whole department of public records was taken out of the hands of the clergy and made secular, and they could have no reason for adding purely secular records to their canonical archives.

But with the Restoration the Church was re-established, and the civil function of the priests as registrars restored. Then in the nature of things a new motive would arise – the desire to obliterate as far as possible all traces of the interregnum, and to have the ancient order of things go on apparently as if it had not been interrupted. This statement of Mr. Brown is fortified by the fact that these transcripts are not signed, or in any other manner formally authenticated. All that seems to have been done was to make copies of the Parish Registers, carefully substituting, however, the word 'christened' for 'born' in every case, and file them at the Archdeanery to fill the hiatus in the ecclesiastical records. The ecclesiastical motive for this substitution is apparent, but the civil record must stand unquestioned.

More than enough has been said to dismiss the entry in this transcript register from further consideration, but fortunately Mr. Brown has furnished us with a unique entry which throws additional light upon the general subject and the temper of the clergy in regard to this Act. Nothing better illustrates the peevish resentment of the priests to the Act of August, 1653, than the following note, taken from the Register of Maid's Moreton Parish, in Buckinghamshire:

'A.D. 1653. Now came in force a goodly Act made by the Usurper Cromwell's little Parliament, who ordered not the baptism, but the birth of children, to be recorded in the Parish Register. And though the baptism of some be not expressed here, yet these are to certify all whom it may concern, and that on the word of a priest, that there is no person hereafter mentioned by the then Register of the parish, but was duly and orderly baptized!'

The *animus* of the man who boldly foisted this extra-judicial note of interpretation into this Register, is evinced on its face. The legally appointed Register did not write it in 1653; it was smuggled in at a much later date, and for a purpose. It speaks of him as 'the *then*' Register of the parish, and of Cromwell as the 'Usurper,' forms of expression which the lawful Registrar of 1653 could not have used. The writer of this note understood the Act of 1653 to make a broad distinction between birth and baptism, and says that it 'ordered not the *baptism* but the *birth* of children, to be recorded in the Parish Register,' and this distinction the interpolator of the note did not relish. Hence the record at Maid's Moreton expressed just what the Act honestly required: the record of the birth of the children and not of their baptism. He says that the baptism of 'some' was not expressed in the record. And why? Simply because the law did not allow the word baptism in the Register. But as he dared not to alter the record itself, and yet

wanted to spite the memory of the 'Usurper,' he must needs bring outside testimony to corrupt the sense of the document. However, he could find no one in Maid's Moreton to serve as his witness but a priest, who was sadly disgruntled because marriage, the registration in parish records, and the right to force christening on all babes, whether their parents wanted it or not, had been taken from him. So, without giving his name or permitting his cross-examination, he is called in to give his 'word.' Contrary to the letter and spirit of the Act of 1653, a gloss must be introduced into an official register, and the 'word of a priest' must certify that at Maid's Moreton the 'Usurper' had been cheated, and that, in exact harmony with the priestly wishes of the witness, and to his great delectation these particular children had been 'duly and orderly baptized,' law or no law. This absurd note awakens the suspicion that it might possibly have been written by the 'priest' himself. Yet it serves to show with what accuracy all the provisions of the Act had been enforced, and that, for this reason, the 'priest' wanted to take off the sharp edge of the record itself.

In plain English, this 'priest' was piqued by the provisions of the Act, and intended to falsify the record, and so far as he could, in his helplessness, to nullify its effect. However, as this is not the record at Elstow, and that attempts no such shameless perversion of the law, the exact truth stands with the Elstow entry, as Bunyan intended it to stand, when it affirms that his daughter, Elizabeth, was 'borne' April 14th, 1654. John Bunyan himself is responsible for this entry, and not a 'priest.' Whoever foisted the word 'christened' into the transcript at Bedford, made at least six years afterward, might have strongly desired that she had been christened, but her father had no hand in making the copy, and, having good reasons for not christening her, simply certifies to the birth of his babe, in the form provided by the

Chapter 4 - British Baptists – John Bunyan

then existing law. In view of this original entry at Elstow, Bunyan may consistently ask, 'What acts of disobedience do we indulge in? "In the sin of infant baptism?"' The record that he made leaves nothing in his conduct to 'reconcile' with his professions as a Baptist, nor can he be held responsible for the substitution of a word in the professed copy which he never put into the original.

This record leaves the great writer where he put himself and where his brethren have always

put him. Douglas says of the English Baptists: 'As to the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, they confined these to persons who had made a scriptural and credible profession of their faith in Christ; and with reference to the former, they regarded it as the great line of demarkation between the Church and the world. Such were the views of Bunyan, and the generality of the Baptists in former days.' [Douglas, *Hist. Northern Baptist Churches*, p. 306]

Chapter 5 - British Baptists – John Bunyan – Continued

The third Record to be examined reads thus: 'St. Cuthbert's, Bedford, 1672. Baptized Joseph Bunyan, ye son of John Bunyan, Nov. 16th.'

The name of John Bunyan is found here. But what John Bunyan? The author of 'Pilgrim's Progress'? No; but of his son, John, Jr. And what of this particular Joseph Bunyan? was he the son of the Dreamer? No; but his grandson. If Mr. Brown had submitted one line of reliable evidence, each as would be accepted by any judge and jury in England, to prove the identity of the Bedford pastor with the 'John' of this record, it would utter a much more decisive voice. In the absence of all direct documentary evidence, outside of the name 'John Bunyan,' found in the record itself, we are thrown back upon circumstantial evidence to interpret the record. Mr. Brown reasons thus, to give his own words, as they lie before the writer, dated May 1st, 1886:

'Joseph Bunyan is described in the St. Cuthbert's Register as the son of John. We are absolutely certain that John Bunyan, the writer of the "Pilgrim's Progress," lived in St. Cuthbert's Parish in 1672. We have a complete list of every householder in the parish for the purpose of the Hearth Tax of 1673-74. There were only forty-seven, and there is only one John Bunyan in the list.'

Amazed that so calm and talented an author should predicate so grave a conclusion in history on so slight a premise, for his book took the same ground, it was suggested to him that as John Bunyan, Jr., was himself a grandfather somewhere about 1694, he must have been a father in 1672, and who was so likely to be his son as the Joseph who was christened in that year? The further question was also asked him as to where John Bunyan, Jr., lived in 1672? This reply was given: 'We have evidence in the Corporation Records, that John Bunyan, Jr., leased a house in the parish of St. Paul's, and would not therefore be at liberty to have a child

baptized at the church of another parish.' On reminding Mr. Brown that this lease in St. Paul's was not given to John Bunyan, Jr., by the corporation until May 11th, 1705, when his father had been dead seventeen years, there seemed less difficulty than ever in believing that the John Bunyan, whose son was baptized in St. Cuthbert's in 1672, was the junior John Bunyan, and that he lived in that parish at that time, especially as there is not one line of proof that the senior John Bunyan was a householder in that parish until 1681. In a later letter, bearing date May 21, 1886, Mr. Brown most kindly and truly says:

'In the absence of documents we are left to conjectural probability. Bunyan's will describes him as of the parish of St. Cuthbert's in 1685, the Hearth Tax-list of 1673-74 gives one John Bunyan and only one in the same tax. So does the Hearth Tax-list of 1670-71, which I have found since I last wrote to you. The entry of his name as a householder even while he was still in prison would seem to indicate that he was living in the same house at the time of his arrest.'

Now Bunyan came out of prison in May, 1672, and as his so-called will locates him in St. Cuthbert's in 1685, thirteen years afterward, it can have no bearing whatever upon the whereabouts of his family in 1672. As the name of a John Bunyan is found on the Tax-list of 1670-71, two years before the John Bunyan came out of prison, as well as on that of 1673-74, two years after he came out of prison, the fair conclusion is that the name on the Tax-list was that of the same person for the entire four years, without yielding the slightest 'conjectural probability' that it identified the Dreamer in any of those years. Least of all do these lists prove that from 1661 to 1672, the years of his imprisonment, he was paying Hearth Tax to the government, when from other sources we know that he was supporting himself and his family,

during those years, by making tagged laces to supplement what charity gave to keep them from starvation. More of the Hearth Tax however, hereafter.

Mr. Brown's principle is a sound one; namely, 'That in the absence of documents we are left to conjectural probability;' and, as such probability can only be based upon circumstantial evidence in this case, the patience of the reader is asked to a calm investigation of the confusion in which history has left Bunyan's immediate household and place of residence as an aid to the understanding of this record. This process calls for a moderately clear idea of his two marriages, and the number of his children, together with their names and the time and order of their birth. We have seen that John Bunyan, Sr, was born in 1628. When he was first married is not known, but an almost universal tradition places this event in his eighteenth year. He was about seventeen when he returned from the army, and he himself tells us that 'Presently after this I changed my condition into a married state,' which, allowing several months' interval, justifies Mr. Copner, the present vicar of Elstow and its incumbent for the last eighteen years, in saying, in his recently published 'Life of Bunyan:'

'Not later, I think, than the spring of 1647 he married...He left his father's house, and took up his abode as a married man in a cottage in Elstow. For the next seven or eight years he lived in the village...He was only eighteen – perhaps not more than seventeen – when he married. Some have thought that he may have married at a considerably later date. This, however, is impossible, since it is inconsistent altogether with what he says of himself in "Grace Abounding." ...In 1658 he lost his wife.'

This cannot be far from correct, for when his second wife went to the Court of Assize, at Bedford, to plead for his liberation from prison, in August, 1661, she said, while under

examination, that she had four children to provide for, and had nothing to live upon but the charity of friends. Sir Matthew Hale, the judge, asked: 'Hast thou four children? thou art but a young woman to have four children!' She replied: 'My lord, I am but mother-in-law to them (stepmother) not having been married to him full two years.' This would bring his second marriage to 1659, and should settle the fact that in 1661 he had four children living, by his first wife, all of whom were born between 1647 and 1658. Subsequent facts warrant the reasonable probability that they were born in this order; namely, John, Mary, Elizabeth and Thomas. Mary was christened in July, 1650, more than three years after his marriage; Elizabeth was born in April, 1654; and we have no birth record or baptismal record of either John or Thomas. As all the four were born within eleven years, it is not natural to suppose that his two daughters were the only children born to him within the first seven years of the eleven; nor is it likely that he remained childless for more than three years after his marriage, when Mary was born. But John, conceded to be his eldest son, was himself the grandfather of Hannah Bunyan, at the latest, by 1698, when he would be but about fifty years of age. We have no knowledge of any great-grandchildren of Pastor Bunyan's but Hannah, and we know that she was the granddaughter of John Bunyan, Jr.; it is, therefore, reasonable to account John, Jr., as the first-born of the four, and to fix his birth in 1648 – or 1649, at the latest.

Now, in returning to the St. Cuthbert record, the first thing to note is its date, November 16th, 1672, the year of Bunyan's release from prison. It is generally conceded that a Joseph was the son of Bunyan's second wife, although Mr. Copner, who has access to the same records with Mr. Brown, thinks that Bunyan's own son Joseph was the son of his first wife, and that the only child of his second wife, who grew up, was

Chapter 5 - British Baptists – John Bunyan – Continued

Sarah. Be this as it may, November, 1672, brings us to the thirteenth year after Bunyan's second marriage. But, outside of this record, there is not one line of evidence to prove that he had a son born to him under these circumstances. Bunyan died in 1688, and a son born to him in 1672 would make him leave a fatherless youth between fifteen and sixteen years of age at the time of his death, after he had been married to that boy's mother for nine and twenty years; that is, from 1659 to 1688. We have not one iota of data as to when Sarah or Joseph was born, nor as to which was the youngest, nor is it reasonable to suppose that either of them was born thirteen years after the marriage of their parents; when the first babe of those parents, who died at birth, was born within two years of their marriage, as the mother herself told Judge Hale in 1661. If it be objected that Bunyan and his wife lived apart while he was in prison, and so these two children, Sarah and Joseph, were born after his release; it may be answered that he not only visited his church frequently and went to London and other places during the time of his imprisonment, but that on 'mainprize' he spent considerable time with his family, wherever they lived. Besides, if Joseph was born in 1672, after his father's term of imprisonment, then must Sarah have been born after Joseph, and so, when he died at the age of sixty, he must have left a little girl as well as a young boy, for his second wife had no living children of her own when she appeared before Sir Matthew Hale in 1661. Either both of her children were born while he was a prisoner or both afterward, and as the reasonable conclusion is, that they were born between 1661 and 1672, the Joseph who was christened in the last of these years was not his son, but his grandson and the son of John Bunyan, Jr., who, at that time, would be little, if any thing, less than twenty-four years of age, and every way likely to have a son, and to be living at that time in the parish

of St. Cuthbert's.

One step more in this investigation. Hannah Bunyan's history throws a strong light upon this record, and by the highest probability connects it with the household of John Bunyan, Jr., her grandfather. The following is his last will and testament. This document is dated December 13th, 1728, and was proved a month later:

'In the name of God, Amen. I, John Bunyan, of Bedford, Bracier, being well in body and of sound mind and memory, Praised be God! do make and ordain my last Will and Testament in manner following. That is to say, I give, devise and bequeath to my granddaughter, Hannah Bunyan, whom I have brought up from a child, and who now lives with me, my house in the parish of St. Cuthbert's, wherein Joseph Simonds, the younger, now lives, with the outhouses, yard, garden and all the appurtenances thereto belonging, to her and her heirs forever. Item, I give to her, my said granddaughter, the lease of the house I live in and all the rest of my personal estate, goods and chattels, ready money, debt, household goods and the implements or utensils of trade and all my stock in trade. All these I give to my said granddaughter, Hannah Bunyan, she paying all my just debts and funeral expenses. And I constitute and appoint the said Hannah Bunyan whole and sole executrix of this my last Will and Testament.'

Religiously, John Bunyan, Jr., appears to have belonged to the Church of England, until he united with his father's Church, June 27th, 1693, about five years after the death of his father, and remained a member thereof until his own death, in 1728. Hannah Bunyan was the daughter of John Jr.'s son, whose name is not positively known, a point to be considered immediately. She lived and died a maiden lady, retaining her father's name, Bunyan. She became a member of her great-grandfather's Church, and a tablet to her memory now stands in the vestibule of the Bunyan Meeting-house at

Bedford, which reads thus:

'In memory of Hannah Bunyan, who departed this life 15th Feb., 1770, aged 76. N.B. She was great-granddaughter to the Reverend and justly celebrated Mr. John Bunyan, who died at London, 31st August, 1688, aged 60 years, and was buried in Bunhill Fields, where there is a stone erected to his memory. He was a minister of the Gospel here 32 years, and during that period suffered 12 years imprisonment. The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.'

If she was 76 years old in 1770, she must have been born in 1694, and the question arises, Whether any son of John Bunyan, Jr., lived at that time, who was likely to be her father? The parish register of St. Paul's, Bedford, has these entries: '1694, Dec. Married Joseph Bunyan and Mary Charnock.' Oct. 6, 1695, records the christening of 'Charnock, ye son' of this couple, and Oct., 1696, that of Ann, their daughter, with her burial a month later. All the circumstances tend to show, that the same Joseph Bunyan who was christened in 1672 was married in 1694, at the age of twenty-two, and Mr. Brown says, that after Nov., 1696, 'all further trace of Joseph Bunyan disappears,' which is equally true of his wife and children so far as direct record goes. John Bunyan, Jr., says, that, as Hannah's grandfather, he had brought 'her up from a child,' and that she 'still lived with' him in 1728. Who then was his son and her father? All reasonable probability points to Joseph Bunyan; to Hannah's birth about 1697, and to her father's death in the same year. This likelihood furnishes a sufficient reason why her grandfather should have brought her up and why she had always lived with him. It is not likely that he would have taken her as a helpless babe had her own father lived. We have no record of the exact year of her birth, although her monument states that she was 76 years old in the year 1770; leaving abundant room for a mistake of three years in

her age, which would make her 73 instead of 76 at her death. Joseph was clearly a State-churchman and had his two children Charnock and Ann christened. But we have no record either of the birth or christening of Hannah, and if she was his daughter, born after his death and brought up in the house of her grandfather, this is a sufficient reason why we have no record of her christening, for he had joined the Bedford Church in 1693, and would not have had her christened in the Church of England. Put all these dates and facts together, with the leading fact, that she was great-granddaughter to Pastor Bunyan, and granddaughter to his son John, and there is large room for reasonable conjecture that the Joseph Bunyan who was christened in 1672 became her father somewhere between his marriage in 1694 and 1697. As to the question of her exact age at the time of her death, it is universally known that persons living over seventy years, and in the absence of all family or other records, are very likely to make a mistake of several years in computing their age. But we have no record of Hannah Bunyan's birth, and considering that she is reputed to have been 76 at the time of her death, a deduction of three years would make this long list of dates agree, and still leave her 73 years of age when she died. This would bring her alleged age as near to accuracy as we generally find reckoning where memory and family tradition are relied upon entirely to determine a birth-date. So far as appears, these were all the data that were depended on in deciding what age she was at her death. All her immediate household seem to have passed away, for she appears to have been the only heir left when her grandfather made his will, in 1728. It is the more difficult to get at her exact age for the reason that she left no children; having at the time of her death neither father nor mother, brother nor sister, so far as appears, and her grandfather who brought her up having been dead for forty-two years when she died.

Strangers only were left to erect her tablet in the Bunyan Meeting-house, for it does not appear by whom it was erected, nor even when. As she inherited her grandfather's property, the reasonable inference is, that it was paid for out of the money which she left, and in the absence of all exact and reliable data those who put it up were obliged to determine her age as best they could: an every-day occurrence in such cases.

Really, all that is definitely known of Hannah Bunyan is, that she was the child of a son of John Bunyan, Jr., that her father's father had brought her up as his own child, that after his death she became a member of the Bunyan Church, and that she died in 1770, at more than seventy years of age. Who then is so likely to have been her father as the Joseph who was christened in 1672 and married in 1694? This would allow her the age ascribed to her on her tablet, aside from the ordinary mistakes of memory where nothing is written, and would utterly avoid all the inconsistencies involved in the theory that her great-grandfather had a son who was her great-uncle when he was but a young man of twenty-two. Which is the most likely, that Joseph Bunyan was her great-uncle or her father when he was that age? It is certain that he was either the one or the other; and reasonable conjecture ought not to halt long in deciding which. Certainly there were two John Bunyans, married men, father and son, living in Bedford in 1672, to have made the one a grandfather and the other a great-grandfather in 1694-97, and somebody must have been Hannah Bunyan's father, to whom she held the relation of child at that time. This makes her relationship complete, child to Joseph, grandchild to John, Jr., and great-grandchild to the Bedford pastor, not earlier than 1694, nor later than 1697. This line of conjectural probability finds a strong confirmation in the Registers of St. Paul's and St. Cuthbert's, and more than both in the will of John Bunyan, Jr., together with the age of his

granddaughter. But what is of vastly more consequence, it redeems the name of honest John Bunyan from an injustice and a series of inconsistencies from which he cannot be redeemed by the supposition that he had a son Joseph christened in the Church of England almost immediately after his release from prison. Why had he been in prison for nearly thirteen years? Let him answer that question himself:

'I was indicted for an upholder and maintainer of unlawful assemblies and conventicles, and for not conforming to the Church of England. There was a bill of indictment preferred against me. The extent thereof was as followeth: "That John Bunyan of the town of Bedford, laborer, being a person of such and such conditions, he hath (since such a time) devilishly and perniciously abstained from coming to church to hear divine service, and is a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the great disturbance and distraction of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our sovereign lord the king.'"

Queen Elizabeth had passed a sanguinary Act 'For the punishment of persons refusing to come to church.' It provided, that any person above sixteen years of age who refused to attend the reading of Common-prayer in some church, should be first imprisoned, then if he refused to sign a declaration of conformity within three months he should be banished, and if he returned to England he should suffer death without benefit of clergy. It was under this brutal Act that Bunyan was charged with 'devilishly' abstaining from coming to church. Besides, shortly after he was put in prison, the Act of Conformity (1662) made the Prayer-book the national standard of faith, enforced by the penal laws of all preceding reigns. But why did he stay away from church, after telling us that when a boy he almost worshiped the parson and his vestments and the Prayer-book, looking upon

them all with the most holy awe? Because he had become convinced that the clergy were corrupt and he now looked upon them with supreme contempt. In his 'Justification by Faith,' signed 'John Bunyan, From Prison, the 27th of the 12th month, 1671,' he says to Fowler, a clergyman of the Church of England, who had vilified him: 'What you say about "doubtful opinion, alterable modes, rites, and circumstances in religion" (p. 239), I know none so wedded thereto as yourselves, even the whole gang of your rabbling, counterfeit clergy; who generally, like the ape you speak of, he blowing up the applause and glory of your trumpety.' Yet, now we are asked to believe that within a year of writing this blast against the clergy, he went to this 'counterfeit, rabbling gang' to get his baby christened! And why would he not listen to the Prayer-book? 'It is none of God's institution,' he said. His contempt for the Prayer-book lay at the bottom of all his sufferings. When Judge Keeling, in a towering passion, at his trial, asked why he stayed away from church, he calmly answered: 'The word of God does not command me to pray by the Common Prayer-book.' Keeling learnedly told him that this book had come down from the Apostles! This, the Bedford laborer ventured to doubt, saying: 'Show me the place in the Epistles where the Common Prayer-book is written, or one text in Scripture that commands me to read it and I will read it.' Again, he tells us, that when he was out of prison for a short time, in 1661-62, he took every occasion 'to visit the people of God, exhorting them to be steadfast in the faith of Jesus Christ, and to take heed that they touched not the Prayer-book.' In his work on Prayer, written as his second work in prison (1662), he says of those whom the Act of Conformity forced to use the Prayer-book, and whom he designates:

'Every cursed whoremaster, thief, and

drunkard, swearer and perjured person,...with their blasphemous throats and hypocritical hearts, they will come to church and say, "Our Father." Nay, further, these men, though every time they say to God, "Our Father," do most abominably blaspheme, yet they must be compelled thus to do. And because others that are of more sober principles scruple the truth of such vain traditions; therefore they must be looked upon to be the only enemies of God and the nation; when as it is their own cursed superstition that doth set the great God against them, and cause them to count them for his enemies.'

Then did he detest the Prayer-book purely because wicked men were compelled to use it, and its use made them hypocrites? Not at all; but because of its intrinsic demerits, as he regarded them. He denounces it as an 'invention of men,' and writes:

'It is evident also that by the silencing of God's dear ministers, though never so powerfully enabled by the spirit of prayer, if they in conscience cannot admit that form of Common-prayer. If this be not an exalting the Common Prayer-book, above either praying by the Spirit or preaching the word, I have taken my mark amiss...It is a sad sign that that which is one of the most eminent parts of the pretended worship of God is antichristian when it hath nothing but the tradition of men and the strength of persecution to uphold or plead for it.'

More than denouncing it as 'antichristian,' he says that it 'muzzles up prayer in a form,' and calls it a work of 'scraps and fragments devised by popes and friars.' Yet, the intolerant demanded that he should use it or surrender all his rights of citizenship. Because he flung it to the winds and would pray without it, the Justices sent Cobb, the clerk of the court, after he had been in prison three months, to persuade him to submit, by coming to some church in Bedford to hear it read. Bunyan told him: 'I will stand by the truth to the last drop of my blood.' He tells

us, that at the beginning of his imprisonment he expected to suffer martyrdom on the gallows: 'This, therefore, lay with great trouble upon me, for methought I was ashamed to die with a pale face and tottering knees for such a cause as this.' And he resisted the Prayer-book to the bitter end. Near the close of his imprisonment he writes:

'If nothing will do unless I make my conscience a continual butchery and slaughter-shop, unless, putting out my own eyes, I commit me to the blind to lead me, as I doubt not is desired by some, I have determined, the Almighty God being my helper and shield, yet to suffer if frail life may continue so long, even till the moss shall grow on mine eyebrows, rather than thus to violate my faith and principles.'

And still again, in the Preface to his 'Confession of Faith,' published in 1672, the year of his release from prison, but written two years before, he declares:

'I have not been so sordid as to stand to a doctrine, right or wrong, when so weighty an argument as above eleven years' imprisonment is continually flogging of me to weigh and pause, and pause again, the grounds and foundation of those principles for which I thus have suffered. But having, not only at my trial asserted them, but also since, even all this tedious tract of time, by the word of God, examined them and found them good, I cannot, I dare not now revolt or deny the same, on pain of eternal damnation.'

The mere suggestion is simply shocking to every sensitive mind, that John Bunyan, who had thus denounced the clergy and the Church of England with the Prayer-book, and who had suffered for more than twelve long years after this fashion, should leave his 'Den,' take charge of a Dissenting Church as its pastor, and then make straight for that National Church, turn his back upon his whole past life and pretensions, and ask the very men who in that very year he

had publicly denounced as a 'gang of rabbling counterfeit clergy,' to christen his child by reading over it this same 'antichristian' Prayer-book! Then take into account his pronounced convictions against infant baptism, and the very suggestion becomes an imposition. Southey well says, that he differed from the doctrines of the Church of England 'on the point of infant baptism.' How could he say any thing else with these declarations of Bunyan before his eyes? In his 'Come and Welcome' he lays great stress on the word 'him' that cometh to Christ saying:

'Christ shows also hereby that no lineage, kindred, or relation can at all be profited by any outward or carnal union with the person that the Father hath given to Christ. It is only him, the given him, the coming him that he intends absolutely to secure. Men make a great ado with the children of believers; and Oh the children of believers! But if the child of the believer is not the him concerned in this absolute promise, it is not these great men's cry, nor yet what the parent or child can do, that can interest him in this promise of the Lord Jesus, this absolute promise.'

These words were first published in 1678, six years after this alleged christening of Joseph. But in 1673, only one year after this alleged christening, when Kiffin, already quoted in part, asked him why he indulged 'the Baptists (that is, the members of the Bedford Church) in many acts of disobedience? For to come unprepared into the church is an act of disobedience; to come unprepared to the Supper is an act of disobedience.' Bunyan resented the charge with great spirit demanding: 'But what acts of disobedience do we indulge them in? "In the sin of infant baptism?" We indulge them not; but being commanded to bear with the infirmities of each other, suffer it; it being indeed in our eyes such; but in theirs they say a duty, till God shall otherwise persuade them.' On the same page he says, that he cannot 'press baptism in our notion, on those that cannot bear it.' Here, to say the

Baptists of Great Britain

least, he regards infant baptism as the 'infirmity' of those who practiced it, which he could 'suffer' 'till God shall otherwise persuade them.'

If Bunyan had had no such scruples on infant baptism as are here stated, if he had a babe born to him in 1672 and he desired him christened, he could have done this himself as pastor of the Bedford Church, or any Pedobaptist dissenting minister in England would have cheerfully done it for him. But the supreme absurdity of sending him off to the National Church to have this done, bears its contradiction on its face. What must he have done in such a case purely as a matter-of-fact in order to meet the demands of the Rubric itself? This certainly it required:

'There shall be for every male-child to be baptized two godfathers and one godmother...The godfathers and godmothers, and the people with the children must be ready at the Font, either immediately after the last Lesson at Morning-Prayer, or else immediately after the last Lesson at Evening Prayer, as the Curate by his discretion shall appoint.'

The Church of England had been trying to crush out Bunyan's congregation for about nineteen years, and Mr. Brown shows us that the Bedford Church was not able to hold its meetings for five years and a half, from 1663 to 1668. The Conventicle Act almost ground it to powder. Yet, by the light of St. Cuthbert's Register, we are now to believe that four years later, its new pastor, John Bunyan, fresh from his 'Den,' did without either making a wry face or laughing, pick out two godfathers and a godmother, and with his loving wife Elizabeth carrying the babe, plodded through the streets of Bedford, taking this heroic band at his heels, to St. Cuthbert's, to have the Prayer-book read over his child by a priest of the Church of England and that babe christened into its fellowship! The ordeal must have been very trying to one of his principles; for the Rubric further required that the priest should say to the godfathers and godmothers:

'This infant must also faithfully for his part promise by you that are his sureties, until he come of age to take it upon himself, that he will renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy word, and obediently keep his commandments.'

The priest was then required to ask Joseph, through these godparents, if he renounced the 'devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same and the carnal desires of the flesh.' Then the little one was to reply, in the hearing of John, his half-martyred father, through his godparents of course: 'I renounce them all.' Again, he was asked if he believed the Apostles' Creed, and it was solemnly read to him that he might understand what he was doing, when he meekly answered: 'All this I steadfastly believe.' The priest at St. Cuthbert's finally put the question to him: 'Wilt thou be baptized in This faith?' and he eagerly answered: 'This is my desire.' When the priest had made 'a cross upon the child's forehead' and had otherwise christened him he said, seeing

'That this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits.' Then he gave thanks in these words: 'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with the Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church.'

After exhorting the godfathers and godmothers to teach the babe 'The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue,' he then gave them this solemn charge: 'Ye are to take care that this child he brought to the Bishop to be confirmed;' when they went out, that Bunyan the Dreamer might prepare Joseph to be 'bishopt.'

Scarcely can any thing be imagined less in

harmony with the stern convictions of Bunyan on 'vain traditions' than his 'Amen' to such a scene. And of this all may be assured, that if he ever went on such a pilgrimage he did not take his book of 1663, 'Praying in the Spirit,' under one arm, and his 'Defense of Justification,' his work of 1672, under the other; for these would not have entirely agreed with the Prayer-book which the priest read for him that day. The Register tells us that a John Bunyan went through this foolish ceremony, but this could not well have been the author of these works. There was too little Slough of Despond, heavy burden on the back, Wicket Gate, and falling of the load into the Redeemer's Tomb, in the whole farce to suit him; and altogether too much Prayer-book, sponsor, priesthood and signing of the cross, to secure that regeneration, adoption and incorporation into Christ's holy Church which he sought for his children. If he really did submit this child to this process he must have coveted for him some fancied good thereby, which he withheld from John and Elizabeth Thomas and Sarah. Or if he withheld these from christening because of its apprehended evils, none can divine why he exposed Joseph to these evils and not his brethren. Then these two remarkable filings follow; namely, that the Church of England should have kept his recantation a profound secret, and that, if it were not secret, his own Church should have taken no exception to his conduct. He tells us that he was indicted and imprisoned 'For not conforming to the Church of England.' he had been denouncing its clergy and Prayer-book for nineteen years, for which crime he had been kept in his 'Den' for more than twelve years. And now he had taken himself 'home' to this very Church, begging for its ordinance and membership therein for his child through the agency of that clergy and Prayer-book. Nay, he put his recantation on the public record of St. Cuthbert's Parish, and neither Cobb, nor Keeling, nor Fowler ever

heard a word about it, nor was the news of his recantation rung from one end of the kingdom to the other, nor have we any knowledge that Charles II ever told John Owen that his favorite 'tinker,' whom he so much loved to hear 'prate,' had down on his knees and conformed at last. The best interpreters of Bunyan tell us that Win. Swinton, the spy who had dogged the steps of Bunyan and the Baptists for years, was the Mr. Badman of Bunyan's pen and the sexton of St. Cuthbert's Church, where he and Feckman plotted their destruction; yet Swinton prudently said nothing about this recantation. Bunyan was the most public man in Bedford, and with this thing known to two godfathers and one godmother, the priest, Swinton and Bunyan, six in all, it could not have been much of a secret, to say nothing of the public Register open to the inspection of all. Yet that Church which Bunyan had warned for twenty-three years against 'touching the Prayer-book,' and which never had touched it, took no exception whatever to its pastor's new adhesion to the Prayer-book! Its members had been fined and distressed because they would not conform, and now its pastor had conformed and promised to bring his child to the 'Bishop to be confirmed;' and still his Church was as much delighted with him as ever. Hereby, however, hangs an interesting story of Bunyan and his Church, and the action which they took in somewhat similar cases. On the 13th of November, 1668, Bunyan's Church appointed himself and 'Harrington a committee to admonish Brother Merrill concerning his withdrawing from the Church and his conformity to ye world's way of worship.' They were instructed to 'endeavor his conviction for his sin in his withdrawal.' Brother Merrill had compromised his brethren, in placing himself under the instruction of an episcopally ordained ministry, whose offices and functions they rejected, and had united with them in the use of the Prayer-book, which they despised as tartly as

Bunyan himself. On October 14th, 1669, William Man and John Crocker reported, that they also had visited Brother Merrill, and 'though their words and carriage were so winning and full of bowels that he could not well breake out into that impatency as he had sometimes done,' yet he told them that he 'would have no more to do with them, bidding them to do their worst.' The Church then sent Brother Bunyan and Brother Breeden once more to admonish him. But on the 14th of January, 1670, Bunyan and six other brethren signed a written report, stating, that as Humphrey Merrill had 'openly recanted his profession,' they recommended that he be 'cut off from and cast out of this Church of Christ,' which, 'in full assembly,' the Church adopted. A year later, April 21st, 1671, on Bunyan's recommendation again, and after patient labor, the Church excluded Robert Nelson, because 'in a great assembly of the Church of England he was openly and profanely bishoped after the Anti-Christian order of that Generation; to ye great profanation of God's order and heart-breaking of his Christian brethren.' Now, to be 'bishopt' was to be blessed or confirmed by the Bishop, and this action shows that Nelson had never before been a communicant of the National Church, as confirmation is a condition precedent to the Supper in that Church. It may be remarked in passing, that this word is very old. Richard of Gloucester, Piers and Wickliff all used it, and Grose tells us that in very ancient times, when the Bishop passed through a town or village, the women ran to receive his blessing, and often left the milk on the fire till it was burnt; hence, in Yorkshire, burnt milk is called 'bishoped' to this day. Thomas Edwards complained grievously, in 1645, that formerly 'we had bishoping of children: now we have bishoping of men and women by strange laying on of hands.'

Here, then, we have the Church at Bedford excluding Merrill for the double 'sin' of speaking

contemptuously of that body and for worshiping with the Church of England 'in the world's way;' then Nelson is cut off for being confirmed 'profanely, after the Anti-Christian order of that Generation.' And now we are asked to believe that the pastor and committee-man of that Church, who recommended and secured the exclusion of these, his brethren, did one year thereafter take his own son to be christened by this same 'Anti-Christian Generation,' the necessary act preparatory to being 'bishopt;' and after all this, that he promised there 'to take care that this child be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed,' without 'ye great profanation of God's order, and heart-breaking to his Christian brethren.' That is to say, he compromised his own ordination and that of all the dissenting ministers in Great Britain, by seeking baptism at the hands of an Episcopal minister, and yet either that his Church never knew any thing about it, or that his conduct in doing so 'never so much as ruffled the spirit' of the Bedford Church!

This is about where the St. Cuthbert's record lands all the parties concerned, when it is forced into a service which reflects upon John Bunyan's character for consistency and casts a slur upon his spotless memory. In the series of records of the Bedford Church, it is shown that that Church was sensitive in the extreme on all points which carried the appearance of fellowship with the Church of England, and to have had his child christened in that Church preparatory to 'bishopsing' would have rent his own flock to pieces. Froude had the right estimate of Bunyan's intense character and spirit when he said of him that this was his aim: 'Be true to yourself whatever comes. Better hell with an honest heart than heaven with cowardice and insincerity.' Mr. Brown's eloquent address delivered at the unveiling of the Bunyan statue at Bedford, June 10th, 1874, better illustrates Bunyan's consistency than the doubt thrown

upon it by an unnatural interpretation of the St. Cuthbert's record. The statue stands with its back to St. Peter's Church, on which fact Mr. Brown remarked: 'Bunyan seems to be repeating his old offense of turning his back on the parish Church...It is not an easy thing for men of his metal to face about at the word of command.' By a singular coincidence the birth-year of Bunyan witnessed the Bill of Rights, and the year of his death entire deliverance from popish tyranny. But if we must believe that the Register of St. Cuthbert's refers to him, then, after all his protests and sufferings, November 16th, 1672, demonstrates that, having left his 'Den' in May, six short months sufficed him to turn his back upon the consistency and integrity of his religious life-time. For two centuries history has written him as firm in spirit as his own Delectable Mountains, and now we are told that, after all, 'the moss on his eyebrows' did grow so long and thick in his dank prison, that when he came out, a la Rip Van Winkle, he neither knew himself nor did any body else know him. He said to Fowler, in that year: 'Let all men know that I quarrel not with him about things wherein I dissent from the Church of England;' and yet we are now to be thought incredulous for refusing to believe that he conformed to that Church in that year, though to believe that he did, might turn his bones in the 'Baptist Corner' of Bunhill Fields, where he now sleeps.

It has been suggested in various quarters that this matter can be reconciled by supposing that Bunyan's wife might have had the child christened without his knowledge, as several mothers of noted Baptists, who were not Baptists themselves, have had their children christened without the consent of their husbands. No. These women were conscientiously connected with other Churches, and differing with their husbands in their religious views, they felt it incumbent on them, as in others, to do what they esteemed a religious duty. Besides,

the ministers to whom they took their children treated them and their households kindly. But whether Elizabeth Bunyan were a Baptist or not, she was not likely to go to her husband's open persecutors, who had brought all her sorrows upon her head and had treated her husband like a brute and had left her children to starve, to seek their blessing upon a child whom they despised for his father's sake; indeed, she was not a woman of that stamp. She loved her husband too dearly to compromise him in that way. Besides, if the Joseph who was christened was her son, and she had him christened by stealth, on religious conviction, why was she not consistent with herself in doing the same for her daughter, Sarah? and in putting her christening on the same record, if Sarah was born in the same parish? While she almost idolized her husband, he, in turn, almost idolized her. She believed in him and in his view of the Church of England. She pleaded for him before the bench of judges and went to London to pray for his liberty through Lord Barkwood and the House of Lords. And when Sir Matthew Hale pitied her, and asked of her husband's calling, a chorus of the other judges cried out: 'A tinker, my lord!' 'Yes,' said the poor and dauntless woman, 'and because he is a tinker and a poor man, therefore he is despised and cannot have justice.' One of the judges responded in great anger: 'My lord, he will preach and do what he lists.' His noble wife replied: 'He preacheth nothing but the word of God!' The angry judge cried out: 'His doctrine is the doctrine of the devil!' 'My lord,' the true Elizabeth replied, 'when the righteous Judge shall appear, it will be known that his doctrine is not the doctrine of the devil!' Made of that sort of metal, would she yet smuggle her husband's son into the State Church against all his father's preaching, writing and suffering? Could she thus trifle with his religious principles and with her own oppressions in the bargain? Bunyan's teaching to her was that the wife must look upon

her husband:

'As her head and lord. The head of the woman is the man...It is an unseemly thing so much as once in all her life-time to offer to overstep her husband, she ought in every thing to be in subjection to him, and to do all that she doeth, as having her warrant, license and authority from him...The wife is master next her husband, and is to rule all in his absence; yea, in his presence she is to guide the house, to bring up the children; provided, she so do it as the adversary have "no occasion to speak reproachfully."...Therefore, act and do still; as being under the power of the husband.'

The fact is, according to his biographer of 1700: 'In his family he kept up a very strict discipline, in prayer and exhortations.' Hence, there is not the slightest probability that Elizabeth took her child to 'St. Cuthbert's to be christened, nor is the intimation that she did at all to the honor of her name.

Mr. Brown's reason for thinking that Bunyan removed his family from Elstow to Bedford about 1655 is, that there is no birth-record of his children at Elstow after 1654; also, he thinks that his sons, John and Thomas, may have been born at Bedford between 1654 and 1658, although there is no more record of their birth at Bedford than at Elstow. He admits that they might both have been born at Elstow between 1650 and 1654, while conjectural probability points to the birth of John by 1648 or 1649. From this premise he infers that Bunyan's wife and children lived not only in Bedford, but in the parish of St. Cuthbert's there, all through her husband's imprisonment. There is no date whatever to determine clearly when he removed to Bedford; all that we know is, that his indictment says that he was of Bedford in 1661. But in what part of the town he lived then, or his family afterward, till 1681, we know absolutely nothing, the drift of circumstances simply points to the fact, that during his imprisonment his family lived somewhere in the town, at least a

part of that time. Dr. Stebbing, no mean authority on Bunyan, writes: 'On his being finally committed to jail, his poor family must, at first, have found some humble lodging in one of the lanes or back streets of the town. The little blind girl could not have visited him, day after day, through the long winter, and stayed till night-fall, had she been obliged to walk to and from Elstow, nearly two miles of harsh, bleak road.' Mr. Copner, the present vicar of Elstow, thinks that he removed to Bedford about 1654. He says:

'What the precise site of his humble home in Bedford at this time may have been, it were vain to inquire. Nothing whatever is known about it, and no ground exists on which to found a supposition. It is likely enough, of course, that it stood somewhere near his Church, but in what particular street or locality, is absolutely problematical.'

And what he says of 1654 is just as true of the location of his family until 1681. Because Mr. Brown finds a John Bunyan on the Hearth Tax-list of St. Cuthbert's Parish for the years 1670-71, 'while the John Bunyan was still in prison, and the same name occurs again in 1673-74, when he was out of prison, he draws the unwarrantable conclusion that the prisoner Bunyan was a householder in Bedford all through his imprisonment, that he was one of the forty-seven tax-payers in the parish of St. Cuthbert's, and that his family lived in the same house from the time of his arrest in 1661, to the time of his release in May, 1672! This is, indeed, one of his chief grounds for the attempt to identify the author of 'Pilgrim's Progress' with the John Bunyan of the Register of 1672.

This matter of the Hearth-Tax is interesting. Blackstone says, that mention is made of it in Doomsday-book as early as the conquest, by the name of 'fumage,' vulgarly called 'smoke farthings;' paid by custom to the king for every chimney in the house. Under Charles II, 1662, a

tax of two shillings a year was levied on every housekeeper who kept a fire on the hearth. As the value of English money in this reign was at least six times more than it is in the reign of Victoria, this sum would now amount to about twelve shillings sterling, a sum which Bunyan's family could hardly pay out of their deep penury. But what evidence is there that from 1662 to 1672 this law held the imprisoned Bunyan a housekeeper in Bedford, and put his name on the Tax-list in St. Cuthbert's parish? John Bunyan, Sr., had become a housekeeper when he was eighteen, and if his son John was born in 1648, as seems reasonable, he would be twenty-two years of age in 1670; the year in which his name appears on this Tax-list, and every-way likely to be a housekeeper, especially in view of the then poverty of his father's family. Truly, there were two adult John Bunyans in Bedford in 1670, one in prison and one out; and the fact that the Senior Bunyan lived in this particular parish from 1681 onward, and that his son owned a house in that parish afterward, suggests the reasonable thought that this son probably lived there and helped his mother to take care of her children when his father was in prison. This is about all that square candor can claim in the case, either way.

Mr. Brown, however, thinks that the following fact is a strong incident to show, that while Bunyan was in prison he was a 'parishioner,' and the only one of his name in St. Cuthbert's parish. In the month of October, 1670 a contribution of seven shillings was made in that parish, by fifteen contributors, for the relief of certain captive Christians in Algiers. Amongst these is found the name of a 'John Bunnian,' who subscribed sixpence. At that time John Bunyan, the preacher, was in prison, a captive himself, probably as destitute as those in the captivity of Algeria. It seems that this appeal 'was read in church' when he was in bonds at the 'Den,' albeit, he would not have been at that

church if he had been out of jail. Still, Mr. Brown thinks that though he was not there; the sixpence 'was probably contributed by his family on his behalf,' as 'a fine stroke of irony.' It must have been very 'fine.' The Conventicle Act attempted to stamp out his own Church from 1664 to 1668, so that if it met 'for any religious purpose not in conformity with the Church of England,' each person was subject to a fine from £9 to £100, and from three years' imprisonment to seven years' transportation, as he attended from one to three times. Then came the Five Mile Act, in 1665, which fined every minister £40 for preaching within five miles of any city or corporate town, and yet in order to get Joseph Bunyan christened in 1672, we have the Dreamer trying to keep himself and children from starvation by making tagged laces, carefully sending his sixpence to that seven and sixpenny parish, to keep it in good repute for liberality to captured Christians! John Bunyan, Jr., seems to have been moderately prosperous, and judging from the apparent christening of his son two years after, may have given his sixpence. His poor mother had no sixpence to send past the gate of the county jail to Algeria. And one of Bunyan's earliest biographers said, in 1693, that when he

'Came abroad out of prison, he found his temporal affairs were gone to wreck, and he had as to them, to begin again, as if he had newly come into the world...His friends had all along supported him with necessaries, and had been very good to his family'...He did not 'Eat the bread of idleness, for I have been witness that his own hands have ministered to his and his family's necessities, making many hundred gross of long tagged laces.'

When much stronger evidence than this can be adduced that John Bunyan was a 'parishioner' of St. Cuthbert's Church while he was a confessor in Bedford Jail, and that the Joseph christened there in 1672 was his son, the

nineteenth century may lend its ear to the story, but it must be much stronger indeed to challenge its confidence.

Nor is there the slightest evidence that John Bunyan ever was the real owner of the house that he lived in, in St. Cuthbert's parish from 1681 to 1688, either under a leasehold claim or in fee. It is more likely that he lived in it under some tenure from his son John. In his deed, he simply gives the 'premises' to his wife, Elizabeth, as an item in the same sentence with other items, thus: 'To have and to hold all and singular the said goods, chattels, debts, and all other the aforesaid premises.' This instrument is not a will but a deed of gift, of chattels and chattel interests, and does not indicate that he had fee in any real estate; it holds only the form of conveying personal property. But when John Bunyan, Jr. bequeaths the same premises to his granddaughter, he says, in a will proper: 'I give, devise and bequeath' to her, 'my house in the parish of St. Cuthbert's, wherein Joseph Simonds the younger now lives, with the outhouses, yard, garden and all the appurtenances thereto belonging, to her and her heirs forever.' Having disposed of his real estate, he then proceeds to speak of his leasehold and personal estate. Thus, the instrument which he executes is obviously and specifically a will, devising real estate as well as bequeathing personal property. Yet, whether Bunyan, the author, had owned the house that he died in is immaterial, so long as there is no substantial proof that he lived in it between 1670 and 1674, or that he was a householder at that time subject to the Hearth Tax. The fact is cited, that Mr. Bagford once visited Bunyan at his home, where

he saw a Bible with a few other books on a shelf, amongst them 'Pilgrim's Progress.' Still, as no date is given to his visit, this signifies nothing. Nor does he give us the edition of 'Pilgrim,' the first of which was published as late as 1677. As to the lease given by the Corporation of Bedford to John Bunyan, Jr., in 1705, that had better not be mentioned in an honest attempt to determine where he lived in 1672, seventeen years before the lease was given. Taking every thing into the account connected with his special and personal household, we have simply this chain of circumstances: He bequeathed his house in St. Cuthbert's parish to his granddaughter in 1728, in which house his father had lived from 1681 to 1688; it is more in keeping with the natural order of things to infer that it was his name which appeared on the Tax-list of that parish from 1670 to 1674, rather than the name of his father who was in prison till 1672. And, taking all things into consideration on the Senior Bunyan's side of the house, his imprisonment from 1661 to 1671, his abject poverty during those years, the partial dependence of his family on friends for their bread, and the absolute absence of proof as to where they lived while he was in prison; all reasonable conjecture points to the supposition that the Joseph of the baptismal register of 1672 was the son of John Bunyan, Jr. and the grandson of John Bunyan, Sr. The name in the record still stands 'John,' but it must be proven that the John was responsible for its creation, before men of sound judgment can be convinced that it is the record of his Conformity to what he branded as an 'Anti-Christian' body.

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

The anonymous author who took up and finished the narrative of Bunyan's life from the point at which Bunyan stopped, calls himself 'his true friend and long acquaintance;' he says: 'I have taken upon me from my knowledge, and the best account given by other of his friends, to piece this to the thread too soon broke off.' He then tells us, that when Bunyan was converted 'he was baptized into the congregation' at Bedford, 'and admitted a member thereof' Charles Doe, who was a firm Baptist, the author of a work against infant baptism, and who edited an edition of Bunyan's works immediately after his death, writes, that he was acquainted with him about two years and had heard him preach while in prison. Further he adds: 'He did not take up religion upon trust, but grace in him continually struggling with himself and others, took all advantages he lit on to ripen his understanding in religion, and so he lit on the dissenting congregation of Christians at Bedford, and was upon confession of faith baptized.' Offer tells us that the reputed spot where he was baptized is still pointed out in a small stream running up from the river Ouse, near Bedford bridge. This creek was then called, in derision of the Baptists, the 'Ducking-place,' and is still known in Bedford as the mill stream in Duck-mill Lane. Almost all biographers agree in these statements of his two early acquaintances; and Philip, late of Maberley Chapel, London, who was a thoroughly good hater of strict Baptists, writes that Bunyan 'shrunk back from baptism and the sacrament for years, lest he should presume.' Doe is uncertain about the time of his baptism, placing it between 1651 and 1653, a fact which hints at less a halting as Philip mentions. The unbroken testimony is that Gifford immersed him though there is no entry thereof on the record, and for the best of reasons, as we shall see. All are agreed that Gifford, the pastor of

the Bedford Church, did something to him in the Ouse which was called baptism, so that on entering that church both Bunyan and Clifford cast aside as worthless the christening which Bunyan had received when a babe, in 1628, at the Elstow Parish Church.

The ablest disinterested investigators, with remarkable unanimity, state that Bunyan was a Baptist. Froude calls Gifford 'the head of the Baptist community' in Bedford, and adds that Bunyan 'being convinced of sin joined the Baptists.' Scott, the commentator, says that he was admitted a member of the Baptist Church at Bedford. This Church was organized by Gifford in 1650, and consisted at the time of four men and eight women. Copner says: 'Bunyan was now a constant adherent of a small and humble congregation of Baptists in the town of Bedford, and "sat under" the teaching of "holy Mr. Gifford."' Again, he speaks of this body as 'the Baptist communion in Bedford.' Dr. Stebbing, the rector of St. Mary Mounthaw, London, edited and published all Bunyan's works, in 4 vol. imperial octavo, 1859, and dedicated his work to the Bishop of London. This edition is adopted for all references to Bunyan's works in this book. Stebbing was a thorough Bunyanian scholar and pronounces Mr. Gifford 'a humble Baptist minister.' Green in his 'History of the English People' writes of Bunyan, 'He joined a Baptist Church at Bedford.' Dean Stanley calls him 'a Baptist preacher and the preacher of the Baptist Meeting-house at Bedford.' Macaulay states, that 'he joined the Baptists and became a preacher.' The 'Britannica,' the most weighty of the Encyclopaedias, says, 'He joined the Baptist society at Bedford.' This has been the uniform testimony of careful investigators, because the general principles and practices of the Church were Baptist in its early history, and because Bunyan himself was decidedly Baptist after the

open-communion order. Robert Philip and Dr. Stoughton more accurately define the exact status of the Church in ecclesiastical terms. Philip says: 'I do not forget that the Church at Bedford was not wholly a Baptist Church. Its pastor, however, was a Baptist; and the majority seem to have been the same. But they were not strict Baptists.' Stoughton calls it a 'unique society' made up of a number of godly people who seceded from the parish churches at Bedford and chose Gifford for their pastor, and adds: 'The Church he founded was neither exclusively Baptist nor Pedobaptist; members of both kinds were admitted on the same terms...Bunyan was a Baptist.'

Dr. Stoughton's presentation of the case is probably the most exact that has been given by any weighty authority; provided, that by the term 'Pedobaptist' he means simply that some of the constituent members had been christened in their infancy and were received into the new body without immersion. But if he means by that word, that infants were christened in that church, through the pastorates of Gifford, Burton, or Bunyan, its first three pastors, then it is not correct, for there is not the least vestige of evidence that infant baptism was practiced in that body till the time of Ebenezer Chandler, Bunyan's first successor, about forty years after the Church was formed. Chandler's letter marks the introduction of the practice, bearing date Feb. 23, 1691, two years after his settlement. Gifford was so far a Baptist as that he administered immersion to all who wished it, and possibly sprinkled those who wished that, though this is not shown, but christened no children as pastor of this Church; whilst Bunyan was a pronounced Baptist in all things, excepting that he differed with all Christians, Baptist and Pedobaptist, in rejecting baptism as a necessary precedent to the Supper, because he held that baptism was a personal act, and not a Church act. Because Bunyan was a Baptist of

this school and his Church never practiced infant baptism till 1691, but practiced the baptism of believers only, as we shall see, it was called a Baptist Church then and ever since, and properly so.

The peculiar constitution and history of the Church with which he was united as member, deacon, pastor and writer for thirty-five years, throw a mutual interpretation upon his views and practices and their own. As we shall see, few churches in Great Britain have been so agitated, disturbed and divided on all the vital questions which have disquieted its Baptist Churches in the same period of time. In 1774 a Trust Deed was adopted by which the Church is legally known today as a 'Congregation or society of Protestants dissenting from the Church of England, commonly called Independents or Congregationalists, holding mixed communion, with those who scruple the baptizing of infants, commonly called Baptists.' That corporate title itself implies something peculiar in its history, and the marked effects of that history have not been produced without a cause. There are good reasons why the best investigators have always pronounced Gifford, Bunyan and this Church Baptist. Let us now look at the reasons, and at the forces which have rendered this name necessary and true.

As already stated, this Church was formed in 1650, and Bunyan united with it in 1653. For six years after its organization it kept no record which can now be found; but one was kept from 1656, which has been copied, partially at least, and is preserved in the present Church-book. Baptist principles and practices took root in and around Bedford long before this Church existed, they entered into its constituent elements, and appear in the struggles and triumphs of the body for fully a century and a half. These records justify Thomas Scott in saying, that he takes certain facts 'from the entries in the Baptist Church-book' at Bedford.

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

A free congregation was formed at Bedford, under the ministerial labors of Benjamin Coxe, about 1643, seven years before Gifford's congregation was formed and ten years before Bunyan was baptized, he was the son of Bishop Coxe, of the reign of Elizabeth, and a graduate of one of the universities, being at one time a disciple of Laud. Baxter says that he held a controversy at Coventry, and Wilson states that he was sent to prison there in 1643, 'for disputing against infant baptism.' Edward denounces him as 'one Mr. Coxe who came out of Devonshire, an innovator.' This was the Benjamin Coxe who wrote an Appendix to the London Baptist Confession of 1646. This document suggests the doctrine which he preached in Bedford in 1643. He says, page 9:

'Although a true believer, whether baptized or unbaptized, be in a state of salvation, and shall certainly be saved, yet in obedience to the command of Christ every believer ought to desire baptism, and to yield himself to be baptized according to the rule of Christ in his word. And where this obedience is in faith performed, there Christ makes this his ordinance a mean of unspeakable benefit to the believing soul. Acts 2:38. And a true believer that here sees the command of Christ lying upon him, cannot allow himself in disobedience thereto.' Again, page 11: 'Though a believer's right to the use of the Lord's Supper do immediately flow from Jesus Christ apprehended and received by faith, yet inasmuch as all things ought to be done not only decently but also in order, and the word holds forth this order, that disciples should be baptized, and then be taught to observe all things (that is to say, all other things) that Christ demanded of the apostles; and accordingly the apostles first baptized disciples and then admitted them to the use of the Supper, we therefore do not admit any to the use of the Supper, nor communicate with any in the use of this ordinance, but disciples baptized, lest we should have fellowship with them in their doing contrary to order.'

The congregation which he formed at Bedford in 1643 would naturally take his views on this subject. How long it continued does not appear; but it seems to have merged into the company that formed Gifford's Church in 1650. William Dell, rector of Yelden, Bedfordshire, took strong ground against the establishment of religion by law, and his doctrine also filled the air of Bedford some few years later. Most of his views were in common with Baptists and some in common with the Quakers, who came to Bedford in 1656. Edwards says of him, in 1646, that he preached at Marston Church, near Oxford, June 7, 1646, from the last seven verses in Isaiah, in which sermon he said: that only those in the kingdom who had the Spirit of God, were the Church of God; that the New Testament never held a whole nation to be a Church; and that the saints were those now styled 'Anabaptists' and other sectaries. This was his doctrine concerning a Gospel Church. He said: 'All Churches are equal as well as all Christians, all being sisters of one another, beams of one sun, branches of one vine, streams of one fountain, members of one body, branches of one golden candlestick, and so equal in all things.' Dell was one of the ejected ministers, and he lost the mastership of Cains College, Cambridge, with his living. He held the same views of religious liberty that Bunyan held. In a powerful sermon preached before the House of Commons, November 28, 1646, on 'Eight Reformation,' he said:

'It causes disturbances and tumults in the world, when men are forced by outward power to act against their inward principles in the things of God...A man when he sins not against the State, may justly stand for his State-freedom, and to deprive a man of his State-liberty for the kingdom of Christ's sake, as it causes disturbances in the world, so let any man show me any such thing in the Gospel...We exalt Christ Jesus alone in the spiritual Church; and attribute to the

magistrate his full power in the world. But they (the Presbyterians) exalt themselves in Christ's stead in the Church, and set under their feet the magistrate's power in the world...As Christ's kingdom and the kingdoms of the world are distinct, so you would be pleased to keep them so. Not mingle them together yourselves, nor suffer others to do it to the great prejudice and disturbance of both...But would you have no law? No laws in Gods kingdom but God's laws, and they are these three: the law of a new nature; the law of the spirit of life that is in Christ; the law of love.'

In this Antipedobaptist atmosphere the Church at Bedford was founded. The introduction to its records, commencing, as we have seen, in 1656, states that there had long been persons in Bedford and its vicinity who had 'by purse and presence' sought to edify each other according to the New Testament; and who were 'enabled of God to adventure farre in shewing their detestation of ye bishops and their superstitions.' Further, this introduction says, that after they had 'conferred with members of other societies,' most likely that gathered by Coxe being amongst them, they formed a Church of twelve members, and chose John Gifford 'for their minister in Jesus Christ, and to be their pastor and bishop.' Here we see that in all likelihood, Coxe and Dell had first introduced the Baptist leaven into Bedford, and how, thereby, so many of the twelve came to be Baptists as well as Gifford himself. They adopted this principle as the foundation of their fellowship, in the words of the record. 'Now the principle upon which they thus entered into fellowship one with another, and upon which they did afterwards receive those that were added to their body and fellowship, was faith in Christ and Holiness in life, without respect to this or that circumstantial things. By which meanes grace and faith was encouraged, Love and Amity maintained, disputings and occasion to janglings and unprofitable questions

avoyded, and many that were weake in the faith confirmed in the blessing of eternall life.' The fundamental requisition that those who were added to their body and fellowship 'should have faith in Christ and Holiness of life,' precluded the possibility of adding any by infant baptism, and their nonrespect to 'opinion in outward things' left all who should unite with them at liberty to choose their own method of baptism. They thought by this course to avoid 'unprofitable questions,' 'disputings and occasion to janglings,' and so, as is common with those who fear the expression of free thought, they created the surest mode of engendering these evils, and suffer from them as few Churches have in the same length of time. Nothing is clearer than that they were not Quakers, and that at first water-baptism was practiced amongst them in such way as satisfied themselves individually. While we have no exact information of Gifford's personal views concerning the ordinances, we do not need any, for his official position as pastor of such a Church sufficiently defines what they were. After organizing a Church under this compact and accepting its pastorship, it became his duty to sprinkle all who wished to be sprinkled, and to immerse all who wished to be immersed upon their faith in Christ; and his refusal to do so would have repudiated the principle on which his own Church was established. The point to be aimed at, therefore, in this examination is, not what were Gifford's personal views of baptism, not what the personal views of other members were, but what were the views of John Bunyan, and what he held as Gospel baptism, a matter which he could determine for himself.

Theodore Crowley was ejected from St. John's, at Bedford, for refusing to use the Directory, and the corporation to its rectory and hospital appointed Gifford to fill his place in 1653, three years after his Church was formed,

but in September, 1655, he died, and was succeeded in his pastorate by John Burton. Gifford had three daughters and a son born to him between his marriage in 1648, and his death in 1655; or, rather, the last daughter was born after he died. The burial of John, his son, is registered in St. Paul's Parish in 1651; that of Elizabeth, his second daughter, is recorded in the same register for 1665; and Mary, his eldest daughter, is known to have married in 1696. Various other entries relating to him and his family are found in Bedford, but not a line of record has been found anywhere to show that any of his children were christened, which is a fact of great significance; for, as Southey says, a number of those who preached in the parish churches, while the Directory and not the Prayer-book was in force, were Baptists. Hence Gifford, clearly a Baptist in that he cast aside infant baptism, as his baptism of Bunyan attests, was filling the pulpit of St. John's; and Bunyan himself preached more than once in the parish churches.

It is simply idle to reject Bunyan's immersion by Gifford because his name does not appear on the Church record as an immersed member. For the same reason the immersion of Hanserd Knollys, John Clark and Obadiah Holmes may be rejected, because no record of their baptism is known to exist. But in Bunyan's case there are special reasons why no such register is found. Doe says that he was baptized on 'his confession of Christ' between 1651 and 1653, but the Church has no record of any thing that was done at that time as a specific act of its proceedings in receiving any individual members. In 1653 it has a list of members simply, among whose names Bunyan's is found as the nineteenth. Besides this, of set purpose, all baptisms in the body were left unrecorded; Mr. Brown informing us that the word 'baptism' only occurs twice between 1650 and 1690, both cases being in

1656. Under the circumstances it was a matter of absolute necessity that no record of baptisms should be kept. For the Church to have voted on such a question in ordering baptisms, or to have approved their record, would have kept it in a perpetual commotion, instead of promoting its perfect blending, as a body made up of diverse elements. Two lists of members, one of the immersed part of the Church and another of the unimmersed, would have drawn a line directly through the Church, which was the very thing that they, a mixed body, wished to avoid; hence such a record was most studiously discarded. The fact that they were mixed kept them on the alert perpetually against strife and still failed, without attempting to make up separate records of the Baptists and Pedobaptists amongst them, to heat up their controversies withal.

Almost the last act of Pastor Gifford, on his death-bed, was to draw up a remarkable letter to his Church, then numbering not more than thirty members, in which he most solemnly charges them concerning the future. After exhorting them to be constant in their assemblies he comes to the fundamental principle on which the Church stood, saying:

'After you are satisfied about the work of grace in the party you are to join with, the said party do solemnly declare before some of the Church that union with Christ is the foundation of all saints' communion, and not merely your agreement concerning any ordinances of Christ, or any judgment or opinion about externals. And said party ought to declare, whether a brother or sister, that through grace they will walk in love with the Church though there should happen any difference about other things.'

He gives no hint that an infant could be baptized amongst them. The candidate must be a 'brother or sister,' who declares his faith, and about whose personal grace the Church was to be satisfied; for he insisted on a regenerate

membership. Gifford gives his Church just such a charge as any thoughtful Baptist pastor, when dying, would give his Church in that day, in view of the controversies that were then rending the Baptist Churches; such a charge as none but a Baptist Church needed, and such as none but a Baptist pastor would have thought of giving to his Church. He says: 'Concerning separation from the Church about baptism, laying on of hands, anointing with oil, psalms or any externals, I charge every one of you respectively, as you will give an account of it to our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge both quick and dead at his coming, that none of you be found guilty of this great evil.' This serious document, signed in the presence of two brethren as witnesses, and still read to the body once a year, not only evinces the apprehensions of the good man that his little flock might be rent after his death, but also it shows us the material of which it was composed, and the questions on which it stood in jeopardy. He implies that up to that time his personal influence had held them together on these points, for he also affectionately exhorts them to maintain their unity and walk in the ordinances of Christ, by reminding them that they 'were not joined to the ministry, but to Christ and the Church.'

Let us look at these four questions of Gifford's dying charge.

I. THE QUESTION OF SINGING PSALMS IN PUBLIC WORSHIP. This was not absolutely a Baptist question, for some few Independents refused to allow singing; but the Baptist Churches were agitated by this controversy to their very center, and numbers of them were divided into fragments in consequence. The Bedford Church never had singing in their worship during Gifford's or Bunyan's ministry. It was not till 1690 that it was introduced, and then it was confined to the afternoon service. On October 20th, in that

year, at a meeting of the Church, 'it was debated and agreed that Public Singing of Psalms be practiced by the Church, *with a caushion* that none others perform it but such as can sing with grace in their hearts according to the Command of Christ' (the Baptist doctrine at that time was that none but the saints should sing); eighteen brethren voted for the change, with two dissenting. Seven years later, June 7th, 1697, the Church consented that 'Brother Chandler (its pastor), and those of his principle, might have Lybertie to sing the praises of God in the morning of the Lord's day as well as the Afternoon.' By the year 1700, three years later, the Church had wrought itself up to the conclusion, 'that there should be liberty to sing at every meeting of preaching, week days as well as Lord's days.' This squeamishness on the question of 'psalms' shows the need of Gifford's dying charge, and that the proportion of Baptist element in the Church was large at the time of his death and the division of his Church imminent on the 'psalm' question. Jukes, afterward pastor of the Church, gives us Chandler's letter on the subject to the members who lived at Gamlingay, in which he says: 'Our brethren have determined that those that are persuaded in their conscience that public singing is an ordinance of God shall practice it on the Lord's day in our meeting at Bedford. Those that are of different judgment have their liberty whether they sing there or no, or whether they be present while we sing, so that they don't turn their backs on other parts of God's worship. Neither is it at all designed to be imposed or proposed to any other meeting, of the Church.' So singing was introduced after a hard struggle.

II. AS TO BAPTISM, the Church record shows that there was equal need of the dying pastor's charge on this subject. At that time this question had ceased to disturb the congregations of other Christian

denominations, but amongst Baptist Churches its relation to communion had already 'separated' many of them; and twice afterward the question of baptism divided the Bedford Church itself. He very strongly hints, however, in his charge, that at that time some in his Church wanted to make baptism an 'ordinance of Christ,' a test of 'communion' in that Church, and he wanted all who came into its fellowship thereafter 'to solemnly declare' that it should not be made such a test as far as they were concerned. In other words, he called it an 'external' and laid down the very principle for governing the 'communion' of the Church, which Bunyan enforced afterward, showing that he drank in his open-communion principles from Gifford. Indeed; it required little less than a miracle to preserve the peace of such a mixed body. Although Gifford had died only in September. 1655, yet in 1656 we have these entries on the Church record: 'Our sister Linford having, upon the account of Baptism (as she pretended), withdrawn from the congregation, was required to be at the meeting to render a reason for her so doing;' and a month later Brother Crompe, who had been proposed for membership, 'desires to stay still upon the account of baptism.' These records are about as blind as they can well be made, and were probably made blind for a purpose, but they show that Gifford had good reason for his charge, as the little Church was not by any means united on this subject, more than on that of psalms. In some way, which does not appear precisely, they were in serious trouble about baptism.

III. AS TO 'ANOINTING WITH OIL;' this was exclusively another Baptist subject, so far as now appears. No other Churches in England but theirs were rent about anointing the sick; but hot debates on this point greatly disturbed many of our Churches there. Several Baptist writers of that day lay great stress upon the

anointing with oil, from James 5:14, for the healing of the sick, notably amongst them Grantham, in his 'Ancient Christianity' (Part II, p. 31). Thomas Edwards says that at a meeting in Aldgate, in 1646, Knollys and Jessey anointed a blind woman with oil, and earnestly prayed over her that God would bless this ordinance and restore her sight. Again he says that another woman, named Palmer, living in Smithfield, was visited by William Kiffin and Thomas Patient, when very ill; that they anointed her with oil and prayed for her, when she suddenly recovered, and, going to the meeting, 'proclaimed that she was healed.' He told these stories in his usually exaggerated way and Kiffin called some of his statements in question, but seems not to have denied the substance of them. And certain it is that some Baptists made the anointing of the sick with oil for their recovery, with prayer by the elders, an ordinance to be observed by Church members. Gifford clearly saw that his Church was threatened with division on this subject, and was alarmed accordingly; and D'Anvers wrote a strong treatise against this practice as popish, for the purpose of saving Baptist Churches from destruction thereon.

IV. THE 'LAYING ON OF HANDS' was another burning question in Baptist Churches which troubled Gifford in the hour of death. It arose about the interpretation of Hebrews 6:1,2, in regard to the imposition of hands upon the heads of the immersed between their baptism and their admittance to the Supper; many urging it as an ordinance of Christ in which both ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were granted. D'Anvers gives an account of what he considers its introduction amongst Baptists, from an eyewitness, in 1646. Mr. Cornwell preached at Bishopsgate from this passage, when many fell on their knees and were put 'under hands,' as in ordination; this act made a division not only in that Church, but

'amongst many others in the nation, ever since, who have kept that distance from their brethren, not owning the same, as not esteeming or communicating with them as the true Church of God, because defective in one of the beginning principles or foundations of the Christian religion.' Its great defenders were Cornwell, Fisher, Griffith, Rider, Jessey and Grantham; while D'Anvers and others opposed it as unscriptural. Grantham was of the ancient family by that name, in Lincolnshire, of great influence as a scholar, and the Churches in that county readily adopted his views. He says: 'God hath in these days begun to revive this neglected truth in the baptized Churches of this nation.' But the Churches were divided in every direction, especially in Wales and the midland counties in England; and the agitation finally gave rise to the Six Principle Baptist Association in 1690, only two years after Bunyan's death. D'Anvers says that 'some of eminency amongst us have lately so had this conviction, as to plead reformation therein with their brethren, and who, I doubt not, from the true sense of the bitter fruit, even the gall and wormwood that have been brought forth therefrom, will naturally be led to consider the root.'

According to Adam Taylor, Churches broke fellowship with each other on this point, and the storm raged most violently in the region round about Bedford. In 1653, only two years before Gifford's death, the Baptist Church at Westby, Lincolnshire, demanded of the Baptist Church at Fenstanton, in Huntingdonshire, about twenty miles north-east of Bedford, their scriptural authority for admitting any to the Supper who had not submitted to the laying on of hands. Other Churches than Baptist knew nothing whatever of this contest, but their Churches, both open and strict communion alike, were violently rent by it, especially the open Churches, like those of Westby and

Fenstanton. If, then; the larger number in Gifford's Church were not Baptists, as Philips avows the majority to have been, why did this issue plant a thorn in his pillow when dying? and how, if he had neither immersed Bunyan nor others in the Ouse, came so many Baptists into his Church? The question concerned none in any Church but those that were immersed. Then it is very significant, too, that this troublesome tenet was bequeathed to Bunyan's term of office as pastor, as we see by his 'Exhortation to Peace and Unity.'

But before quoting him on this point a word may be necessary on the authenticity of this book, as some doubt its genuineness because of its learning and general style, and more because, by insisting upon baptism as indispensable to Church fellowship, it seems to contradict him in other places. Yet the date of its publication, 1688, the very year of his death, indicates the use of his maturest attainments in its composition, while some of these 'learned' features, so called, are found in several of his later works. The fact that Doe did not include it in his edition proves nothing, as several of Bunyan's productions were not found for years after his death, notably amongst them his 'Spiritual Poems,' which did not come to light till twelve years after; even his 'will,' which was left in the house where he died, was not discovered for more than a hundred years afterward. Dr. Stebbins says of the 'Exhortation:' 'We know of no protests uttered by any of his friends tending to deny that it proceeded from his pen...The learning which it is supposed to display is far too slight and accidental to be properly urged as a proof that he did not write it...None, indeed, of the common objections urged against its authenticity seem of much weight.' No one has done fuller justice to Bunyan on the score of intelligence than Copner, the present vicar of the Church at Elstow, where Bunyan rang the

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

bells. He thinks that:

'Before his school days were over, besides the ability to read, write and do sums in elementary arithmetic, he had gained a respectable smattering of Latin, if not also of Greek, and I am not at all sure that in later life he did not somehow or other pick up in addition some small acquaintance with Hebrew, for the sake of obtaining a clearer insight into the meaning of the Jewish Scriptures, which, to judge from his extraordinary knowledge of them, he, without doubt, must have most constantly and industriously studied. It is true that he says in one of his religious treatises, "The Law and Grace Unfolded," that he "never went to school to Aristotle or Plato." He plainly states, however, that he was at a grammar school; and, if so, what grammar school could he have been at but the grammar school at Bedford?...Bunyan, I take it, was for a short time at this Latin school; and certainly he frequently uses Latin words and expressions in his works. For instance, he employs the expression *primum mobile* for the soul, and "old *Mors*" for death, and speaking of "the river of life," in the book of the Revelation, he calls it *aqua vita*. Again, in his "Divine Emblems," he names the sun *Sol*, and makes use elsewhere in several places of such Latin expressions as *probatum est, nolens volens, caveat, and verbatim*.'

Bunyan uses no more learned terms in his 'Exhortation' than he does in several of his other works; even in his rude verses he uses the word 'Machiavel,' as well as in his 'Exhortation.' But while in that work he makes more than eighty citations from the Scriptures, he uses the phrase 'divide et impera' – divide and rule – once, and *terra incognita* twice. Besides, he refers to classical stories three times, but he refers to Bible history as many scores of times.

These considerations, taken in connection with the general Bunyanian style of the work, seen in such extracts as the following, give strong internal evidence of its genuineness. After speaking fully of faith, baptism and

holiness of life, Bunyan writes on this very subject of laying on of hands and its necessity, that there

'Are such things as relate to the well-being and not to the being of the Churches: as laying on of hands in the primitive times upon believers, by which they did receive the gifts of the Spirit; this, I say, was for the increase and edifying of the body, and not that thereby they might become of the body of Christ, for that they were before. And do not think that I believe laying on of hands was no apostolical institution, because I say men are not thereby made members of Christ's body, or because I say that it is not essential to Church communion. Why should I be thought to be against a fire in the chimney, because I say it must not be in the thatch of the house? Consider then how pernicious a thing it is to make every doctrine, though true, the bond of communion. This is that which destroys unity, and by this rule all men must be perfect before they can be at peace...Let me appeal to such, and demand of them, if there was not a time, since they believed and were baptized, wherein they did not believe laying on of hands a duty? and did they not then believe, and do they not still believe, they are members of the body of Christ?'

There is not a more marked Bunyanesque passage in his writings than this; and in so far as that it disallows the imposition of hands on the baptized as a bond of communion, it agrees precisely with Gifford's charge, for Bunyan put it just where he puts baptism in that respect. While at the same time he holds it as an 'apostolical institution' for the 'edifying' of the Church, which carries the implication that the Bedford Church practiced it on the immersed. This accounts for the further fact, that Gifford did not charge the body to eschew it or to put it away, but only not to 'separate' from the Church on that account; a great evil, he says, 'which some have committed – and that through a zeal for God, yet not according to knowledge.' Even under his ministry it seems that some had

separated from his Church on these questions. If Gifford and Bunyan were not Baptists, and a large part of the Bedford Church with them, they were strange human anachronisms, to be perplexed in this way with these four burning Baptist questions; and Gifford would have had as much reason for charging them in death not to choose a Pope as to give the charge that he did, for the one would have been as opposite as the other, had they not been in danger on these four disputed points.

Jessey appears to have been Bunyan's ideal of a true Baptist, and it is not a little singular that their views on this subject should have been precisely alike. In a letter which he and his Church, in London, wrote to the Church at Hexham, in October, 1653, they say:

'We are not wanting to propound these six things, that should once be laid down, they are spoke of in Heb.6:1,2, and we endeavour to inform all therein we judge faithful being propounded to us. But if some cannot receive what is held out about baptism, laying on of hands, or singing, etc., and yet show forth teachableness and peaceableness, we dare not exclude such from this visible kingdom of God merely for weaknesse' sake. Some grounds for such practice are laid down in that book (written by Jessey) called Store-house.'

Another set of facts bear as directly upon this subject as the truth of history can make them. For five years, from 1663 to 1668, there is another significant break in the records of the Bedford Church. After 1662, under the Act of Uniformity, the line between the Conformists and Non-conformists became broader than ever, and the latter were to be furiously stamped out by the former. During these five years and a half, persecution had compelled the Church to hold its meetings when and where it could, but in October, 1668, the record begins again. Under this stress some of the members had quailed, and the after processes of discipline

show the pain which the Church endured in consequence and the causes thereof. The Conventicle Act expired March 2, 1668, but was re-enacted April 11, 1670, about which time the Church of England had a hard struggle for life in and around Bedford. Foster, the Commissary of the Archdeacon's Court, had all he could do to resist the innovations upon the Episcopal Church; in a year and a half he held four courts at Ampthill and four at Bedford, in which he punished his opponents. His courts were crowded with persons who were

'Tried, excommunicated, or imprisoned for refusing to pay church rates, dues or tithes; for refusing to come to church for more than a month, FOR NOT HAVING THEIR CHILDREN BAPTIZED, for being present at the burial of an excommunicated person, for being at and keeping a conventicle, for refusing to receive the sacrament at Easter, for not being churchd, for being absent from church six months, etc.'

Even the under-jailer at Bedford, who had charge of Bunyan in prison, refused to pay his own church-rate; and Foster passed judgment in two years upon 1,400 cases of these sorts in the County of Bedford. Bedford was in the diocese of Lincoln, the records of which See show, that in 1669-70 there was a conventicle there, in the parish of St. Paul's, numbering about thirty, and it calls four members of the Bunyan meeting by name.

The same record reports for those years in Bedford and its vicinity, a numbering of the Lord's people, with this result: At Pavenham, 40 Baptists; at Stevington, 30; at Blunham, 50; at Edworth, 20; at Northill, 12; at Caddington, 40; and at Houghton Regis, 30. The total returns in the diocesan records showing, of Independents, 220; of Quakers, 390; and of Baptists, 277, there being 57 more Baptists than Independents.

No sooner does the Bedford Church-record

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

fairly re-open, but we find the question of baptism all alive again, as a practical question. In 1669 the Church, open communion as it was, felt obliged to solemnly guard its ordinances. Under date of January 14, a Mr. Sewster being crooked on the subject of communion, the Church ordered that 'Brother Bunyan and Brother Man should reason with Mr. Sewster about his desire of breaking bread with this congregation without sitting down as a member with us.' This clearly indicates that at that time membership in the Church was necessary to a place at its table, and that in some shape baptism entered into the question of communion with the Church. Notwithstanding, this must have been a hard job for 'Brother Bunyan,' he and 'Brother Man' brought Mr. Sewster to his sober senses on this subject, for several times thereafter the records speak of Sewster as a useful member of the Church, and the inference is that he had been a pretty stubborn strict communist till Brother Bunyan straightened him out. At the same meeting it was voted that 'Brother Bunyan should discourse with Sister Landy about those scruples that lye upon her conscience about breaking bread with this congregation.' All must regret that these 'scruples' are not more fully stated; but on Feb. 25th, Bunyan reported her to the Church 'as willing to receive instruction, 'and his labors as a committee were continued to endeavor her further satisfaction.' The same case came up again June 18th, when 'Was our Sister Landy withdrawn from. The causes were for that she had withdrawn communion from the saints, had despised gifts from the Church, had taught her children to play at cards, and remained impenitent after several admonitions.' Taken altogether, this case looks much as if her trump card was that terrible notion of 'Close Communion.' She had 'withdrawn from communion,' they had 'endeavored' her satisfaction, on professing her

willingness to be instructed, but she had withdrawn communion with the Church, and 'had despised gifts in the Church,' which expression smacks strongly of opposition on her part to the laying on of hands, which Bunyan says he believed was an 'apostolic institution.' The record of the meeting also contains a very suggestive form of nomenclature seldom found outside of Baptist Churches, saying: 'The congregation also having taken into consideration the desire of Gamlingay friends to joyne with us, did agree that next meeting they should come over and give in their experience,' and those friends came fifteen miles to pass that Baptist ordeal.

Rev. John Jukes, a predecessor of Rev. John Brown, says in his 'History of the Church,' that John Burton, pastor between Grifford and Bunyan, 'like his predecessor, was a Baptist.' Bunyan was a deacon under his ministry, and on the death of Burton the Church offered the pastorate to Rev. Mr. Wheeler, who declined. But in October, 1663, 'Rev. Samuel Fenn and Rev. John Whiteman, both ministers of their own body and of the Baptist denomination, were ordained joint pastors.' The meeting at which Bunyan was called to the pastorate was held Jan. 21st, 1672, and at that meeting seven others were examined and called to the work of the ministry, after the Church had solemnly approved their gifts. One of these was Rev. Nehemiah Coxe, D.D., whose history throws much light upon the character of the Bedford Church. He was a native of Bedford and was received into the fellowship of this Church June 14th, 1669, while Bunyan was one of its preachers, but nearly two years before he became its pastor. There is every reason for believing that he was immersed, and probably by Bunyan himself, as he became a Baptist minister of great note, without any change of ecclesiastical or doctrinal sentiments, so far as is known. Hence, a brief sketch of him will be

acceptable here, for showing what sort of men the Bedford Church raised up at that time. Wilson, no mean judge of men, pronounces him 'an excellent and judicious divine.' In April, 1673, he was called to the pastoral office at Hitchin, near Bedford, but declined the invitation. Scott says: 'The Baptist congregation at Hitchin, in Hertfordshire, is supposed to have been founded by Bunyan;' and he calls 'John Wilson, the first pastor of the Baptist flock at Hitchin.' Jukes says, that 'Nehemiah Coxe is said to have been imprisoned at Bedford for preaching the Gospel.' The Bedford Church records tell us, that on May 7th, 1674, when Bunyan was pastor, Coxe was brought before the Church for 'several words and practices that might justly be censured, as having a tendency to make rents and divisions in the congregation, for which he expressed himself as repentant and sorry.' With their usual kindness in cases of this sort, the records leave us in the dark as to the nature of his offense, yet they imply that it related to some point of faith or practice about which there were differences of opinion in the body, and as he was a stout Baptist, they, most likely, had reference to some Baptist differences. Afterward, he settled as pastor of the Baptist Church at Cranfield, in Bedfordshire, and then, in 1675, as assistant pastor in London, to the Church in Petty France, which he served till his death, in 1688. He was an able writer, and published a reply to Dr. Whiston's defense of infant baptism, also several other works. Sutcliff says that he was a cordwainer at Craufield, and when brought to trial at the Bedford Assizes, he pleaded his cause first in Greek and then in Hebrew. The judge expressed his surprise, remarking that none there could answer him. Coxe claimed the right to plead in what language he pleased. The judge dismissed him, saying to the bar 'Well, the cordwainer has wound us all up, gentlemen.' This story is told also by Dr. Stoughton, in his

'Life of John Howard.'

The following cases present the meaning of Bunyan, when he said that 'some were rent and dismembered from us' on the communion issue, and also demonstrates that these were not handled with overweening tenderness. So fixed did he and his Church become, that they refused to give their immersed members letters of dismission to strict Baptist Churches. In 1672, Mrs. Tilney, a lady of high standing in Bedford and a member of the Church, who had suffered much for Christ before her removal to London, asked for a letter to the Church there, where her son-in-law, Mr. Blakey, was pastor. They refused it on the ground that the London Church made immersion an indispensable condition of membership. This shows that she was immersed as a member in Bedford, or a letter would not have taken her into Blakey's Church, albeit she could have been received into his Church on her experience and baptized without a letter. In writing to her under date of July 19th, Bunyan tells her that the Bedford Church required her to 'forbear to sit down at the table with any without the consent of our brethren... We shall consent to your sitting down with Brother Cockain, Brother Griffith, or Brother Palmer. So that the Bedford Church, in Bunyan's time, was open communion to all but the members of strict communion Baptist Churches. After Bunyan's death, these Baptist questions kept this Church in perpetual excitement. Henry Mann desired a letter to an immersed Church, which was denied him, Jan. 6th, 1695. 'Sister Stover, December, 1700, desired a letter of dismission to the General Baptist Church in Hart Street, London, John Piggott pastor; which was denied, because of the 'received principles and practices of this Church.' Ann Tutzell was refused a letter, March 1, 1720, to the Particular Baptist Church meeting in Currier's Hall, London, John Skepp, pastor: 'Because he and his people were for

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

communion with baptized believers only, and that by immersion.' She was evidently an immersed member of the Bedford Church.

Ebenezer Chandler was Bunyan's first successor, and Samuel Sanderson his second, who, personally, were Pedobaptists. It is of the first of these that Jukes says, it appears that the principle of this Church was 'defined by Gifford its practice as conformed to that principle was determined by Chandler...All Bunyan's teaching had, no doubt, served to increase the attachment between his brethren to Gifford's principle, and to prepare them for Chandler's practice.' And what was Chandler's practice but the introduction of infant baptism into the body. Jukes gives us this letter from Chandler, written Feb. 23d, 1691, to those members who lived at Gamlingay and formed a branch Church there:

'With respect to infant baptism, I have my liberty to baptize infants without making it my business to promote it among others, and every member is to have his liberty in regard to believer's baptism; only to forbear discourse and debate on it, that may have a tendency to break the peace of the Church. When thought expedient the Church doth design to choose an administrator of believer's baptism. We do not mean to make baptism, whether of believers or infants, a bar to communion. Only the Church hath promised that none shall hereafter, to my grief, or trouble, or dissatisfaction, be admitted.'

This letter tells its own story, namely: that heretofore the Church had not christened infants, but now Chandler had got from the Church 'liberty' to do so; and that he had been troubled and grieved to administer 'believer's baptism,' but now another administrator was to be chosen to that end. In reply, the Gamlingay brethren answered:

'We only desire to have liberty to speak or preach believer's baptism, if the Lord shall set it upon our hearts. Yet, with that tenderness as

being far from any such designs as do tend in the least to the breaking the peace of the Church, and do heartily grant our Brother Chandler the same liberty to speak or preach infant baptism, provided with equal tenderness.'

Down to that time, Gifford, Burton, Bunyan and Chandler had administered 'believer's baptism.' It had grieved, troubled and dissatisfied Chandler to do such a thing, but now he was bent on lugging in infant baptism, to the exclusion of believer's baptism so far as he was concerned, for he would baptize no more believers. He says, however, that the Church would choose an administrator to do that, etc. Thomas Cooper, 'a private member of the Church,' says Mr. Brown was chosen for this work. This evinces their firm determination not to be brow-beaten out of the practice. In an appendix to a Funeral Sermon for Rev. Joshua Symonds, another pastor of the Church, John Ryland, Jr. says: 'One, Mr. Cooper, baptized the adults in Mr. Chandler's time.' Wilson says, that under Sanderson's ministry.

'Peace and harmony were preserved in the society notwithstanding some diversity of sentiment, particularly about baptism, a subject which he never brought forward for discussion, nor did he ever baptize any children in public; through fear of moving that controversy. He always dreaded a division, and studied the things that made for peace. By his prudence and good temper he preserved the congregation from those animosities which took place after his death.'

Sanderson understood the metal of the Church too well to force the high-handed measures of Chandler. We have already noticed what those 'animosities' were. Joshua Symonds became their pastor in 1765, he also being a Pedobaptist at the time. But the old Baptist leaven, which had been in the Church from its foundation, kept fermenting, and in February, 1772, he asked the Church to relieve him from

Baptists of Great Britain

the necessity of baptizing infants or sprinkling adults, avowed himself a Baptist, and immersed his wife in the river Ouse. The Church agreed to consider his wishes for a year, but in less time a minority of the congregation left and formed a distinctly Pedobaptist congregation, which chose Thomas Smith as its pastor. John Howard, the philanthropist, who at that time was living near Bedford, went with the new body. The Baptist majority remained with Symonds, the Church numbering 127 members, a baptistery was built in the chapel, and for some years infant baptism was again banished from the congregation. The Church also sent out several pastors to other Churches amongst the Baptists, two being Mr. Read, of Chichester, and John Nichols, of Kimbolton. Jukes says that after the death of Symonds, who served the Church for many years, it was supplied by two Baptists and one Pedobaptist, but it could unite on neither of them for pastor, and when it gave up both of them, it settled Mr. Hillyard, after a year's trial. The old contest on baptism still waged, however, and in process of time a second division took place, and a new Baptist Church went out, formed upon the strict communion principle, which it maintained for many years. It is now known as the Mill Street Church, and numbers 154 members. Its present practice is after the open communion order, but receiving only immersed believers into Church fellowship. The Bunyan Meeting, which owes its primitive vigor to him and bears his name, has always had very strong feeling on the subject of baptism and is not entirely free from it today, as is evinced by the fact, that it still retains its old baptistery, which is occasionally used for the immersion of believers still, although it now ranks as a Congregational Church, but is returned in the *Baptist Handbook* for 1886 as in membership with the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, and is marked under the 'Union Churches,' a term that

denotes 'a Church in which Baptists and Pedobaptists are united.'

Baptisteries were not common in English dissenting chapels in the seventeenth century, especially if a running stream was near, as at Bedford; even in London they were not known until late in the eighteenth century. The baptisms that took place all through the early history of this Church, from Grifford down, were celebrated in the river Ouse, where Bunyan himself was dipped. In a letter dated May 21, 1886, Mr. Brown has kindly furnished the following facts:

'The Baptistery in the old chapel, pulled down in 1849, was fixed there about 1796, as may be inferred from a letter from Thomas Kilpin to Dr. Rippon, dated Jan. 29th, 1796: "My father, after many years' deliberation, has at length made up his mind on the Ordinance of Baptism, and was a few months since, with my sister (about eighteen years) and Mr. Alien, baptized in our new Baptistery" (Dr. Rippon's Correspondence Additional MSS. British Museum, No. 25,387, fol. 376). I have seen it mentioned elsewhere that John Kilpin, the person here referred to, was the first baptized in this baptistery. In Mr. Symond's time, as he mentions in a MS. Diary, the baptisms took place in the river. He says that his wife was the first person baptized thus after his change of view (421), and that as the river was new to him for this purpose, she was carried away and nearly drowned. This would be about twenty years earlier than 1796.'

The Rev. John Jukes tells us that he wrote his history of the Church in 1849, to aid in procuring money for the erection of the new chapel; when this second baptistery, prepared by the old Bunyan congregation, was put into the new building, for as late as that time this Church would not dispense with a baptistery. In a letter from Rev. Thomas Watts, present pastor of the Mill Street Church, dated Bedford, May 31st, 1886, he says: 'There is a baptistery in the Bunyan Meeting-house. I baptized two persons

Chapter 6 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Relations to the Baptists

in it three years ago.' It seems, then, that the Bedford Baptists go to get the good old-fashioned immersion from the Bunyan center yet. It is, however, of the old baptistery that Robert Philip spake thus in 1839: 'I have been unable to identify the spot in the lilied Ouse, where Bunyan was baptized. It may have been

the well-known spot where his successors administered baptism, until a baptistery was introduced into the chapel. The old table over that baptistery is an extraordinary piece of furniture, which for size and strength might have been the banquet-table of a baronial hall.'

Baptists of Great Britain

Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles

Aside from all expression of Bunyan's principles on his own part, it is readily seen why the universal decision of history accounts him a Baptist. But aside from this, there is a certain philosophy about the genius of Bunyan which allies his life so closely and openly with Baptist principles, that it has not escaped the eye of even casual observers. With all Philip's unfriendliness to Baptists, he discovers this at a glance, becomes enamored of Bunyan as a Baptist, and says:

'No one surely can regret that he was baptized by immersion. That was just the mode calculated to impress him – practiced as it usually then was in rivers. He felt the sublimity of the whole scene at the Ouse, as well as its solemnity. Gifford's eye may have realized nothing on the occasion but the meaning of the ordinance, but Bunyan saw Jordan in the lilled Ouse, and John the Baptist in the holy minister, and almost the Dove in the passing birds; while the sun-struck waters flushed around and over him, as if the Shekinah had descended upon them. For let it not be thought that he was indifferent about his baptism because he was indignant against Strict Baptists, and laid more stress upon the doctrine it taught than upon its symbolic significancy. He loved immersion, although he hated the close communion of the Baptist Churches...Bunyan could not look back upon his baptism in infancy (if he was baptized then) with either our emotions or convictions. We think, therefore, that he did wisely in being re-baptized. I think he did right in preferring immersion to sprinkling, not, however, that I believe immersion to be right, or sprinkling wrong, according to any scriptural rule, for there is none, but because the former suited his temperament best, inasmuch as it gave him most to do, and thus most to think of and feel. For that is the best mode of baptism to any man which most absorbs his own mind with its meaning and design.'

With an eye quite as clear and sharp, this writer discovers an intimate connection

between his immersion and the after thoughts and actions of his life, which he expresses thus: 'Had he not been a Baptist, he would have written little more than his 'Pilgrim's Progress' and 'Holy War;' because he knew that profounder theologians than he ever pretended to be, were publishing quite enough, both doctrinal and practical, for every nation to read; but he knew also that the Baptists, as a body, would take a lesson from him more readily, than from an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or an Independent; or at least that he would be read by many who would not read Owen or Baxter. In like manner, had he not been more than a Baptist, he would have written less than he did.' 'Bunyan's adherence,' he continues, 'and attachments to the Baptists, notwithstanding the attacks made upon him, did him great credit. He was also a loser by identifying himself with their name and cause at the Restoration. But he never flinched nor repented. And in this he truly did them justice. Their cause was good and their name bad only by misrepresentation.'

Southey seems to sympathize with this view, in the words: 'Both the world and the Church are indebted to the Baptists for the ministry of Banyan. But for them he might have lived and died a tinker.' And Dean Stanley unites with them both, when he says: 'Neither amongst the dead nor the living who have adorned the Baptist name, is there any before whom other Churches bow their heads so reverently as he who in this place derived his chief spiritual inspiration from them.' But Cheever, who has not been equaled as an interpreter of Bunyan, unless by Offer, goes further than this. He sees a direct act of divine Providence in Bunyan's association with the Baptists and writes:

'To make the highest jewel of the day as a Christian, a minister and a writer, Divine Providence selected a member of the then

Baptists of Great Britain

obscure, persecuted and despised sect of the Baptists. He took John Bunyan: but he did not remove him from the Baptist Church of Christ into what men said was the only true Church; he kept him shining in that Baptist candlestick all his life-time...All gorgeous and prelatical establishments God passed by, and selected the greatest marvel of grace and genius in all the modern age from the Baptist Church in Bedford.'

More than one passage in Bunyan's writings confirm the view of Philip concerning the deep influence of immersion upon his mind, but one will suffice, in which, far beyond the common conception, he puts forth the opinion, that the Lord's Supper as well as baptism symbolizes Christ's overwhelming agony. This he finds implied in his own words: 'Ye shall indeed endure the baptism [immersion in suffering] which I endure.' Hence, Bunyan exclaims: 'That Scripture, "Do this in remembrance of me," was made a very precious word unto me, when I thought of that blessed ordinance, the Lord's Supper, for by it the Lord did come down upon my conscience with the discovery of his death for my sins; and as I then felt, plunged me in the virtue of the same.' Philip says: 'There seems to me in this passage an intended use of terms which should express the views of both classes in his Church on the mode of baptism;' and this may be implied in his words. But Bunyan found his full type of baptism in the Deluge. He says:

'The Flood was a type of three things. First, of the enemies of the Church. Second, a type of the water-baptism under the New Testament. Third, of the last overthrow of the world.' Again, in his 'Exposition of the First Ten Chapters of Genesis,' he remarks: 'That was the time then that God had appointed to try his servant Noah by the waters of the flood: in which time he was so effectually crucified to the things of this world, that he was as if he was never more to enjoy the same. Wherefore Peter maketh mention of this estate of his; he

tells us, it was even like unto our baptism; wherein we profess ourselves dead to the world, and alive to God by Jesus Christ. 1 Peter 3:21.'

As Mr. Brown simply gives voice to a vague and loose notion which is afloat concerning Bunyan's fixed views of baptism when he says that 'he had no very strong feeling any way' on that subject, it is but just to allow him to say for himself what he did believe, and then all can judge whether or not he treated that subject as a matter of indifference. In a 'Reason for My Practice' Bunyan writes of ordinances: 'I believe that Christ hath ordained but two in his Church, namely, water baptism and the Supper of the Lord; both which are of excellent use to the Church in this world, they being to us representations of the death and resurrection of Christ, and are, as God shall make them, helps to our faith therein. But I count them not the fundamentals of Christianity nor grounds or rule to communion with saints.' Great injustice is done to him in the heedlessness which applies these words only to baptism and not to the Supper. What he says here of one ordinance he says of the other; namely, that they stand on a ground of equal excellency, and that he did not count either of them a fundamental of Christianity. He neither idolized the Supper nor treated baptism with indifference, that is the work of his interpreters; but he says that Jesus ordained the two equally; and to say that he had strong feeling about one of Christ's ordinances and no strong feeling about the other, is to put words into his mouth which he never uttered. In his 'Divine Emblems' he says, that he put the two ordinances of the Gospel upon a parity as to authority, and revered them equally.

Two sacraments I do believe there be,
Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.
Both mysteries divine, which do to me,
by God's appointment, benefit afford.'

Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles

He never held the popularly current Quaker view, ascribed to him, that immersion is unimportant and so showed that baptism sat loosely upon him; that is simply what those who misrepresent him hold themselves and wish to find in his writings. But it is not there. He held that immersion on a man's personal faith in Christ is the duty of every man who believes in Christ; that when men receive 'water-baptism' they should be immersed, because there is no other water-baptism but immersion; but he also held that 'water-baptism is not a precedent to the Lord's Supper.' He says as plainly as his use of terse English could, that neither baptism nor the Supper form a 'rule to communion with saints,' and this proposition cannot be taken by halves, without the grossest injustice to him. As it regards baptism and the Supper, there was not the least shade of difference between him and the strict communion Baptists, excepting, that he did not hold baptism to be an act precedent to the breaking of bread at the Lord's table, while they did. He constantly uses the phrases 'water baptism' and 'those of the baptized way,' and the construction is forced upon his words that this form of expression puts a slight upon the immersion of believers. But the strictest of strict Baptists of his day, Kiffin amongst them, used the same phraseology as freely as he did. What other could any of them use? The Quakers all over England, and especially about Bedford, where they abounded, compelled the Baptists to use these forms of utterance in order to make themselves understood. The Friends were constantly using the terms 'spirit-baptism,' and 'baptism of the Spirit,' and the Baptists had no choice left but to use these chosen phrases. Bunyan said to the Quakers most significantly: 'The Kanters are neither for the ordinance of baptism with water, nor breaking of bread, and are not you the same?' In regard to what constituted 'water-baptism,' he had no

difficulty, for he held that it was dipping and only dipping, and so, only those who had been immersed he called 'of the baptized way.' He says of the Baptists and not of the Pedobaptists, that he would 'persuade my brethren of the baptised way not to hold too much thereupon,' and again: 'I put a difference between my brethren of the baptized way. I know some are more moderate than some;' that is, he drew a line between the strict and open communionists. But there is not a passage in the sixty books which he wrote, in which he says that the Pedobaptists are of the 'baptized way,' and protests: 'I would not teach men to break the least of the commandments of God.' So far from laxity, this is his pungent teaching on this point:

'God never ordained significative ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper or the like, for the sake of water or of bread and wine; nor yet because he takes any delight that we are dipped in water or eat that bread; but they are ordained to minister to us by the aptness of the elements through our sincere partaking of them, further knowledge of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and of our death and resurrection by him to newness of life. Wherefore, he that eateth and believeth not, and he that is baptized and is not dead to sin and walketh not in newness of life, neither keepeth these ordinances nor pleaseth God.'

Again, no Baptist ever insisted more earnestly than Bunyan, that faith and regeneration must precede baptism. In his 'Reason for My Practice,' he says that a visible saint

'Is not made so by baptism; for he must be a visible saint before, else he ought not to be baptized. Acts 8:37; 9:17; 16:33.' Then he gives this answer to the question. Why the New Testament saints were baptized? 'That their faith by that figure might be strengthened in the death and resurrection of Christ, and that themselves might see that they have

Baptists of Great Britain

professed themselves dead, and buried, and risen with him to newness of life...He should know by that circumstance that he hath received forgiveness of sin, if his faith be as true as his being baptized is felt by him.' Yet again he says, that he who has not the doctrine of baptism 'ought to have it before he be convicted it is his duty to be baptized, or else he playeth the hypocrite. There is, therefore, no difference between that believer that is and he that is not yet baptized with water, but only his going down into the water, there to perform an outward ceremony the substance of which he hath already.' Still further he writes: 'That our denomination of believers, and of our receiving the doctrine of the Lord Jesus, is not to be reckoned from our baptism is evident, because according to our notion of it, they only that have before received the doctrine of the Gospel, and so show it us by their profession of faith, they only ought to be baptized.' And finally on this point he writes: 'The Scriptures have declared that this faith gives the professors of it a right to baptism, as in the case of the eunuch (Acts 8) when he demanded why he might not be baptized? Philip answereth if he believed with all his heart he might; the eunuch thereupon professing Christ was baptized.' Then he sums up all in these words: 'It is one thing for him that administereth to baptize in the name of Jesus, another thing for him that is the subject by that to be baptized into Jesus. Baptizing into Christ is rather the act of the faith of him that is baptized, than his going into water and coming out again.'

This is the way in which disinterested and broad-minded interpreters understand Bunyan's Baptist principles. The learned Dr. Stebbing, unwilling either to conceal, to add to, or to accept Bunyan's positions, says in the round frankness of a man who has no ends to serve but those of the truth:

'Bunyan belonged to a sect peculiarly strict on the subject of communion. He honestly kept him faithful to its principles; his charity made him inconsistent with its severity. Baptism was regarded by his

associates as furnishing a bond of union indispensable to Christian brotherhood, and unattainable by other means...It was the baptism of adults, capable of repentance and faith, and actually repenting and believing, which alone could fulfill these conditions...He had, therefore, first to defend himself against the charge of unfaithfulness to his party, and then to state the principles, which he thought might form a safer and broader groundwork of Christian communion. In the former part of his task he had only to prove that neither his practice nor his profession had altered from the time of his conversion; that he had ever spoken with all plainness and sincerity on the topics in dispute, and had shown himself as little willing to indulge error among his brethren, as to let truth suffer from his own fear of an enemy. No one could gainsay the defense of his integrity.'

Dr. Stebbing had no sympathy with Bunyan in rejecting baptism as a necessary precedent to the reception of the Supper, because in this he thought his teaching contrary to the New Testament. He holds him at fault for speaking in his writings 'with unhappy violence,' but says that 'he shared largely in the prejudices of the party to which he belonged,' and excuses him therefore on the ground that 'the whole of England was convulsed with a controversy on baptism.'

That history has accorded to Bunyan his proper ecclesiastical place in numbering him with the Baptists is clear, from the place which he assigns to himself in their ranks, and from the place which his most intimate friends as well as his sturdiest opponents amongst the Baptists assigned him. The 'Britannica' says that he had a dispute with some of the chiefs in the sect to which he belonged, and that 'they loudly pronounced him a false brother.' A great controversy on communion was rife amongst the Baptists, about the time that Bunyan took the pastoral charge of the Bedford Church, the leaders being Henry Jessey and Bunyan on one side, and William Kiffin, Henry Denne,

Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles

Thomas Paul and Henry D'Anvers on the other side; this whole dispute, from one end to the other, was a family quarrel amongst the English Baptists, and none but Baptists took part therein. As nearly as can be ascertained, Bunyan published his 'Confession of Faith' in 1672, in which he first fully printed his views on open communion. In 1673 D'Anvers, in his work on baptism, adds a postscript answering this Confession, and refers to Thomas Paul's 'Serious Reflections' thereon, also published in 1673, and written jointly by Paul and Kiffin. These Reflections apparently indulged in serious personalities upon Bunyan as one of themselves, whose novel doctrines threatened to destroy Baptist Churches, and threw blame on Bunyan as a Baptist; to which he takes serious exception in his reply, known as 'Difference of Judgment,' 1673. This was followed by Kiffin's 'Sober Discourse of Right to Church Communion,' proving that no unbaptized person may be regularly admitted to the Lord's Supper.' The earliest edition of the *Reflections* and the *Serious Discourse* now known to exist, bear date 1681, both of them bearing some marks of being second editions, and the only copy of Paul and Kiffin's joint work, known to exist, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. In the 'Preface to the Reflections, signed by W.K.,' who uses these words:

'I suppose the Author of the Confession,...who himself is against the baptizing of children and for the baptizing of believers upon their profession of faith in Christ, makes it none of the least of his arguments, why he is against children's baptism, than this – namely, that there being no president [precedent] or example in the Scriptures for children's baptism, therefore children ought not to be baptized.' The writer then proceeds to argue from the admitted facts of Bunyan's principles and practices, that he should apply the same tests to the communion of non-baptized persons, namely, there being

no Scripture "president" [precedent] or example of such custom.

Could the writers of this book have said this, if he had gone to St. Cuthbert's one year before, to have his child christened? Rather they had branded him as an apostate, instead of claiming him as one of their own denomination but in error. In the body of the book there is the amplest evidence that Bunyan is treated by them as a Baptist. Part of the grief which they express is, that a Baptist should reason as he had done, after his long standing in the Baptist ministry. In his reply, 'Difference of Judgment about Water Baptism no Bar to Communion,' he accepts their alleged facts with their reasonings and makes the following defense of his new position as a Baptist:

'That I deny the ordinance of baptism, or that I have placed one piece of an argument against it (though they feign it), is quite without color of truth. All I say is, that the Church of Christ hath not warrant to keep out of the communion the Christian that is discovered to be a visible saint of the word, the Christian that walketh according to his light with God...I own water baptism to be God's ordinance, but I make no idol of it.'

The London brethren charged Bunyan with stirring up strife in their Churches there on the communion question, to which he replies: 'Next, you tell us of your "goodly harmony in London;" or of the amicable Christian correspondence betwixt those of divers persuasions there, until my turbulent and mutineering spirit got up.' Then he charges, that they had no 'Church communion' with their brethren, but only such as they 'were commanded to have with every brother that walketh disorderly...Touching Mr. Jessey's judgment in the case in hand, you know it condemneth your practice...For your insinuating my abusive and unworthy behavior as the cause of the brethren's attempting to

break our Christian communion, it is not only false but ridiculous; false, for they have attempted to make me also one of their disciples, and sent to me and for me for that purpose. (This attempt began above sixteen years ago.) Besides, it is ridiculous. Surely their pretended order, and as they call it, our disorder was the cause; or they must render themselves very malicious, to seek the overthrow of a whole congregation, for, if it had been so, the unworthy behavior of one.' Again and again he alleges, that his strict brethren had tried to divide his Church and to separate him from it, and so to seek 'the overthrow of a whole congregation.' Whether this charge were correct or not, it would have been simply ridiculous for Kiffin and Paul to have made the attempt or to have thought of it, in the case of a man who was not esteemed by them as a Baptist. On this subject he says, that 'it is one of the things which the Lord hateth, to sow discord among brethren. Yet many years' experience we have had of these mischievous attempts, as also have others in other places, as may be instanced, if occasion require it, and that especially by those of the rigid way of our brethren, the Baptists, so called...Therefore, when I could no longer forbear, I thought good to present to public view the warrantableness of our holy communion, and the unreasonableness of their seeking to break us to pieces.' In another place he says: 'Mine own self they have endeavored to persuade to forsake the Church; some they have sent quite off from us, others they have attempted and attempted to divide and break off from us, but by the mercy of God, have been hitherto prevented.' Admitting this full charge, is it reasonable to suppose that they tried to get a Pedobaptist minister to leave a Pedobaptist congregation and to unite with them, on the ground that they were strict communionists, and that some open communion Pedobaptists did leave and go to the strict Baptists on that

issue?

Kiffin and others put several inconvenient questions to Bunyan which it would have been impertinent in the highest degree to have put to him had they not understood that they were reasoning with one of their own sect. As for example:

'I ask your heart whether popularity and applause of variety of professors be not in the bottom of what you have said; that hath been your snare to pervert the right ways of the Lord, and to lead others into a path wherein we can find none of the footsteps of the flock of the first ages?' Bunyan replies: 'I have been tempted to do what I have done by a provocation of sixteen long years.' 2d Quest. 'Have you dealt brotherly, or like a Christian, to throw so much dirt upon your brethren, in print, in the face of the world, when you had opportunity to converse with them of reputation amongst us before printing, being allowed the liberty by them at the same time for you to speak among them?' He answers that he had 'thrown no dirt,' and 'as to book, it was printed before I spake with any of you, or knew whether I might be accepted of you. As to them of reputation among you, I know others not one whit inferior to them, and have my liberty to consult with whom I like best.' In 1674 the Bedford Church-record shows, that his Church consulted with Jessey's old Church on the communion question, 'that we may the better know what to do as to our Sister Martha Cumberland.' 3d Quest. 'Doth your carriage answer the law of love or civility, when the brethren used means to send for you for a conference, and their letter was received by you, that you should go out again from the city (London), after knowledge of their desires, and not vouchsafe a meeting with them, when the glory of God and the vindication of so many Churches is concerned?' Bunyan's answer: 'The reason why I came not amongst you was partly because I consulted mine own weakness, and counted not myself, being a dull-headed man, able to engage so many of the chief of you, as I was then informed, intended to meet me. I also feared, in personal disputes, heats and

Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles

bitter contentions might arise, a thing my spirit hath not pleasure in. I feared also that both myself and words might be misrepresented.' 4th Quest. 'Is it not the spirit of Diotrephes of old in you, who loved to have the pre-eminence, that you are so bold to keep out all the brethren that are not of your mind in this matter, from having any entertainment in the churches or meetings to which you belong, though you yourself have not been denied the like liberty among them that are contrary-minded to you. Is this the way of your retaliation? Or are you afraid lest the truth should invade your quarters?' Bunyan answered by asking where Diotrephes was, 'in those days that our brethren of the baptized way would not recognize those who were as good as themselves;' as to allowing the strict brethren 'to preach in our assemblies, the reason is, because we cannot yet prevail with them to repent of their Church rending principles.'

The entire ground and spirit of these questions and answers show that the combatants were of one sect, and so understood themselves to be, and this fact is confirmed when Kiffin suggests that Bunyan's principles and practices were against 'Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents,' as well as Baptists, and asks: 'Do you delight to have your hand against every man?'

In a word, his Baptist brethren treated him throughout the whole dispute on the communion question as a Baptist who was inconsistent in his positions, and who was playing into the hands of the Pedobaptists, whether he designed this or not. They charged him with using the very arguments of the Pedobaptists. But if he was a Pedobaptist already, what pertinency was there in such a reflection? In his 'Difference of Judgment' he complains that Kiffin reflects upon him seriously for his freedom to communicate with those 'who differ from me about water-baptism.' He complains that these Baptist brethren had tried to win him and his Church to their views,

saying: 'Yea, myself they have sent for and endeavored to persuade me to break communion with my brethren...Some they did rend and dismember from us...To settle the brethren of our community, and to prevent such disorders among others, was the cause of my publishing my papers.' Then, in his 'Reasons for my Practice,' he writes: 'I can communicate with those visible saints that differ about water-baptism.' But that went without saying, if he were not a Baptist. And finally, as to the allegation that he used the arguments of the Pedo-baptists, he resents the charge with warmth thus: 'I ingenuously tell you, I know not what Paedo means, and how then should I know his arguments?' Which answer is of a piece with the retort to Kiffin, 'You seek thus to scandalize me,' because he demanded concerning Bunyan, 'Wherein lies the force of this man's argument against baptism, as to its place, worth, and continuance?'

That Bunyan and Kiffin stood shoulder to shoulder as Baptists on every point, excepting communion, is as clear as it can be from their own statements. Under the head of 'The Question Stated,' Kiffin says in his 'Sober Discourse:'

'It may be necessary to examine how far we disagree and whether we disagree with our dissenting brethren, because that would prevent much useless discourse, and lead us to debate the matter in dispute only...' 'The professors of the Christian religion are distinguished,' says he, 'by certain terms, invented by their opposites to know them by, as Prelatical, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, etc. And it were well if such names were laid aside and the title of Christian brother resumed, because they agree in fundamentals. Now of all these our controversy in the case in hand is only with some of the last who are (though not rightly) called Anabaptists. As for others, their avowed principle is to admit none to Church-fellowship or communion that are

Baptists of Great Britain

unbaptized...The Church of England receives no member into communion without baptism, neither do Presbyterians, Independents, nor, indeed, any sort of Christians that own ordinances, admit any as a Church-member without baptism. We shall, therefore, direct this discourse to our dissenting brethren of the baptized way only.' He adds, 'Under the term (unbaptized) we comprehend all persons that either were never baptized at all, or such as have been (as they call it) christened or baptized (more properly sprinkled) in their infancy. Now our dissenting brethren, with whom we have to do, look upon this way to be absolutely invalid and so no baptism (else they would not be baptized themselves), and consequently esteem all such as unbaptized; so that we need not prove what is granted.' (Kiffin's 'Sober Discourse,' pp. 2, 9.)

On pages 13,14, he defines what he means by those of 'the baptized way,' calls them 'Baptists,' and says that they are 'reproached' and 'derided' 'for being dipt.' It had been impossible for Kiffin to have addressed Bunyan in such terms had they not recognized each other as Baptists. And Bunyan in his reply not only admits that he and Kiffin saw these things alike, but felt hurt that Kiffin should even venture to hint that he was defective in the views of baptism held by Baptists. He says:

'That the brethren which refuse to be baptized as you and I would have them, refuse it for want of pretended light, becomes you not to imagine...Their conscience may be better than either yours or mine; yet God, for purposes best known to himself, may forbear to give them conviction of their duty in this particular...I advise you again to consider that a man may find baptism to be commanded, may be informed who ought to administer it, may also know the proper subject, and that the manner of baptizing is dipping, and may desire to practice it because it is commanded, and yet know nothing of what water-baptism preacheth, or of the mystery baptism sheweth to faith.'

He then complains bitterly that Kiffin does

not treat persons who were not baptized as it 'is commanded' by the 'manner of dipping' as they should be treated, for he avows that 'they cannot without light be driven into water baptism, I mean after our notion of it...Far better than ourselves, that have not, according to our notion, been baptized with water.' In the same paper he speaks of the godly of the land 'who are not of our persuasion,' and insists that he does not plead 'for a despising of baptism, but a bearing with our brother who cannot do it for want of light.' If he were not a Baptist and supposed himself enlightened in their views, it were absurd for him to be perpetually complaining to Baptists that those who were not dipped after his notion and theirs, failed of this duty for want of light. In his 'Practice and Differences of Judgment' he repeats this from a dozen to twenty times, and then, with an air of injured feeling on their behalf, demands: 'Must all the children of God, that are not baptized for want of light, be still stigmatized for want of serious inquiry after God's mind in it?'

Much needless speculation has been had on Bunyan's status as a Baptist, simply because, in his 'Heavenly Footman,' he says: 'Do not have too much company with some Anabaptists, though I go under that name myself,' and, in his 'Peaceable Principles,' adds: 'As for those factious titles of Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or the like, I conclude that they came neither from Jerusalem nor Antioch, but rather from hell and Babylon, for they naturally tend to divisions.' With good reason Mr. Brown says of Bunyan's affiliation with the Baptists, 'This is plain enough,' when Bunyan calls himself an 'Anabaptist.' Like many other Baptists he did not like to be called by that hateful name, 'Anabaptist,' nor did he like denominational names at all; he preferred to be called a 'Christian,' an honorable feeling that is shared by many in all Christian sects, and yet they fail to suggest better names than those they

Chapter 7 - British Baptists – Bunyan's Principles

answer to. Dr. Southey, with his usual clearness of perception, says of Bunyan: 'Though circumstances had made him a sectarian, he liked not to be called by the denomination of his sect;' yes, and especially when it was perverted to Anabaptist. It is said that even Dr. Samuel Johnson hated this word so mortally, that he refused to put it into the first edition of his Dictionary in 1755. If it was not a simple omission, he must have left it out on other grounds than that of Bunyan's; but, at any rate, it occurs for the first time in Johnson's Lexicon in Todd's edition of 1827. Neither did it seem to distress Bunyan to be called simply a Baptist. When Kiffin asked him, 'Why do you indulge the Baptists in many acts of disobedience?' he showed no resentment. D'Anvers demanded of him, because he thought that his published views of communion impeached the thoroughness of his Baptist position, how long it was since he ceased to be a Baptist? This home-thrust touched Bunyan in a tender spot, for it seemed to reflect upon him for the rejection of his old Baptist principles, and he resented it with his usually high spirit: 'You ask me next how long it is since I was a Baptist?' and then adds, "It is an ill bird that bewrays his own nest." I must tell you, avoiding your slovingly language, I know none to whom this title is so proper as to the disciples of John.' That he was not an Independent is very clear, for D'Anvers tells him that some of the 'sober Independents' had showed dislike to his written notions that baptism did not precede communion. 'What then?' Bunyan replies. 'If I should also say, as I can without lying, that several of the Baptists had wished yours burnt before it had come to light, is your book ever the worse for that?' No Independent could have conducted this controversy on this line of things; and no passage in all his writings bears with more direct force upon this subject than this taken from his 'Differences in Judgment,'

published in the very year that the St. Cuthbert's Register says of some John Bunyan that his baby was christened. In that very year he wrote to his Baptist opponent: 'What if I should also send you to answer those expositors that expound certain Scriptures for infant baptism, and that by them brand us for Pedobaptists, must this drive you from your belief of the truth?'

It has been any thing but a pleasant task to attempt the rescue of this honored historical name from such a brand of inconsistency as the wrong use of the St. Cuthbert's Register must fix upon it, by applying to him an act which it was morally impossible for him to perpetrate without infamy to all the other acts of his religious life and being. A dozen such records, so perverted in their application, can never gainsay the universal voice of history as to the man's principles and character. And outside of these nothing is more notorious than that all his chief friendships were sought by himself amongst Baptists, as in the case of Jessey, who was more the father of open communion views in England than was Bunyan. Nothing seemed more to delight that sturdy Baptist 'friend and acquaintance' of his, Charles Doc, than to speak of him as 'Our Bunyan,' which he does until the repetition wearies. Francis Smith, who published the most, if not all the works which Bunyan wrote while he was in prison, was one of the most thorough Baptists. He was a brave and true character, who set the censor of the press at defiance and was imprisoned again and again as a 'fanatic' because he would, publish 'dangerous books.' He was called 'Elephant Smith,' because he did business at the Elephant and Castle, near Temple Bar, but he was better known as 'Anabaptist Smith;' and would have published Bunyan's 'Grace Abounding,' but he happened to be in prison when it was issued. Many of Bunyan's books were seized at his place in 1666, because he published them

without a license; and the Baptist press has been loaded with his writings ever since. And, last of all, says Philip: 'He was interred at first in the back part of that ground (Bunhill Fields) now known as Baptist Corner.'

While these considerations serve as slight collateral evidences of his denominational connections, the great proof is found in his own words and works, both of which follow him. Although his own Church has forsaken the faith and practice which he taught, there are still many Churches left which received his impress, and have retained it through two hundred years. His labors outside of Bedford, in that and other counties, were abundant: and a number of Baptist Churches therein, which still exist, were then gathered as the result. Philip says: 'Not a few of the Baptist Churches in the county (Bedford) trace their origin to Bishop Bunyan's itineracies, as do some also in the adjoining counties of Cambridge, Hertford, Huntingdon, Buckingham and Northampton.' Alluding to these labors, the 'Britannica' states that 'he had so great an authority among the Baptists that he was popularly called Bishop Bunyan.' This article, written by Macaulay, adds: 'Great as was the authority of Bunyan with the Baptists, that of William Kiffin was still greater.' The present status of these Churches show the model on which he formed them, as an open communion Baptist. Mr. Brown's Church at Northampton, the Union Chapel at Luton, and some others, can elect either a Baptist or a Pedobaptist minister for pastor, though their ministers are now and have been generally Baptists. The Park Street Church at Luton

claims Bunyan as its founder, also that at Hitchin and Hurst-Hempstead. Rev. Mr. Watts, the present pastor of Mill Street Baptist Church, Bedford, says: 'Stagsden, Goldington, Elstow and Kempston are all branches of Banyan's Meeting. Josiah Couder says in "Life and Writings of Bunyan:"

'Reading, in Berkshire, was another place which he frequently visited, and a tradition has been preserved by the Baptist congregation there that he sometimes went through that town dressed like a carter, with a long whip in his hand, to avoid detection. The house in which the Baptists met for worship stood in a lane, and from the back door they had a bridge over a branch of the river Kennett, whereby, in case of alarm, they might escape. In a visit to that place, prompted by his characteristic kindness of heart, he contracted the disease which brought him to his grave.'

Rev. Thomas Watts adds:

'There are very few Congregational Churches in Bedfordshire, and these are mostly of modern formation. It seems certain that John Bunyan was remarkably useful throughout the county, and that his converts either became members of Baptist or Union Churches. We have several Union Churches, but, with the exception of Bunyan Meeting, the minister in every case is a Baptist. The trust-deed at Cotton-End requires the Church to choose a Baptist for their pastor.'

Clearly Bunyan was an open communion Baptist, but as to christening his child in the parish church in 1672; we may well use the Scripture exclamation: 'Go to!'

Chapter 8 - British Baptists – Commonwealth and Restoration

JOHN MILTON, the apostle of liberty and monarch of song, demands our notice, because, whether he was a Baptist or not, he expounded and defended certain elementary Baptist principles as few others have done. Milton was born in 1608, and educated at Cambridge. He was of a serious spirit, full of purity and courage and very modest withal. This soul dwelt in a temple as fair as Apollo's, the picture of beauty and delicacy; so fine, indeed, that the coarser students nicknamed him 'the lady of Christ's College.' As a liberator, he did for England what no man had yet done. He lived when all religions and political traditions were called in question, and all old institutions were being remodeled. Although his early design was to enter the Episcopal ministry, and his preparation was thorough, after examining the claims of Episcopacy, he said that to take orders he 'must subscribe slave,' and this he would do for no man. After seven years' study he took his master's degree, 1632; then retired for five years, studying the Bible, Greek and Roman writers, philosophy and literature, and laying plans for his great life-work. On the death of his mother, in 1638, he went to the Continent, intending to spend some years there. In Paris he became thoroughly acquainted with Grotius, and at Florence had much conversation with Galileo, in the Inquisition. When he heard of the disturbances in England, his patriotism was so stirred that he resolved to return, saying, 'I considered it dishonorable to be enjoying myself at my ease in foreign lands, while my countrymen were striking a blow for freedom.'

At home, he was soon drawn into the front rank as a publicist, dealing with every fundamental principle of the English Constitution. Twenty-five controversial and political works were soon issued from his pen touching great practical questions of statesmanship; the rights of the people, of

rulers, the freedom of the commonwealth, the relations of the Church to the State, of religious liberty, popular education, the laws of marriage and the freedom of the press. These aroused the whole nation as a giant from slumber. He spoke on all subjects with a deep conviction and an honest boldness worthy of a doctrinaire and philosophical civilian. Every point was presented with the clearness of a sunbeam; all could see that the love of liberty dominated him like an inspiration. His principles embodied a new and radical order of things, and a new set of political institutions must spring therefrom, so primal were they. In themselves they were a new creation, so to speak, which appealed to reason and conscience; in a word, the embryo of a free republic. Mark Pattison, no indulgent critic of Milton, is compelled to admit that these works were 'all written on the side of liberty.' He defended religious liberty against the prelates, civil liberty against the crown, the liberty of the press against the executive, liberty of conscience against the Presbyterians, and domestic liberty against the tyranny of canon law. Milton's pamphlets might have been stamped with the motto which Seldon inscribed (in Greek) in all his books: 'Liberty before every thing.' In the depth of his nature he revered God, and used that reverence to ennoble England. While the seething excitement of his times marks his style, which is often rasping, even withering, and betrays that metallic spirit which will neither brook imposition nor cant; yet there was a light and refreshing newness in his temper, which told his foes that he knew what he was talking about, whether they did or not, and which brushed away their impudent assumptions and abuses like dust. His exact calmness of thought and clearness of language made his foes resentful. He was a perfect master of stinging candor, and his nervous invective made his

vehemence calm by the truth which it couched.

The second marked period of his life brought his knowledge of the learned languages into great service. He honored his mother-tongue as a language of ideas, and his prose works will ever remain a monument to its terse greatness. But he wrote Latin as fluently as English, and was chosen Latin secretary to the government soon after the death of Charles I. This was the language of diplomacy at the time, and he filled this station till the reign of Charles II. His office brought him into daily contact with the forty-one who composed the Council of State, especially with the Committee for Foreign Affairs, amongst whom were Vane and Whitelock, Lords Denbigh and Lisle. In company with Cromwell, Fairfax and others, his daily task was to frame difficult dispatches to all nations, in harmony with the new state of things in England, to which, practically, the world was a stranger. In April, 1655, the Duke of Savoy horrified all Europe by the fiendish atrocities which made the valleys of Piedmont run with blood. When news of this savagery reached Protestant England she stood appalled, decreed it high time to stop such insane brutality, and sent Moreland to take the cut-throat of Savoy in hand. As representing a republic, Cromwell had omitted the title of his Royal Highness in the dispatches sent by Moreland to the duke, who proposed to return the demand of England under color of affront. The sober second thought, however, aided by a little common sense and Cardinal Mazarin, brought the butcher to his senses. France was required to stop this cowardly reign of fury, rape and murder. The correspondence which Milton conducted on this subject with the nations of Europe was so just, humane and simple, that it stands an honor to humanity. Its tone is severely moderate, becoming a Christian republic in diplomacy; firm, equitable, manly to deliciousness, and its effect is felt on the

liberties of Europe to this day.

Milton's perpetual labor in the cause of humanity cost him his eyesight. He said that his physicians predicted this when he took up his pen to write against the tyrannies of Charles, 'yet, nothing terrified by their premonition, I did not long balance whether my duty should be preferred to my eyes.' In 1650 the sight of his left eye was gone, and by 1652 the sight of his right eye was also quenched; so that at the age of forty-three he was totally blind, remaining so till his death, twenty-two years after. In another touching passage, which expresses his unyielding sense of responsibility, he says: 'The choice lay before me, between dereliction of a supreme duty and loss of eyesight. In such a case I could not listen to the physician, not if Esculapius himself had spoken from his sanctuary; I could but obey that inward monitor, I know not what, that spoke to me from heaven. I considered with myself that many had purchased less good with worse ill, as they who give their lives to reap only glory; and I thereupon concluded to employ the little remaining eyesight I was to enjoy in doing this, the greatest service to the common weal it was in my power to render.'

The third period of his life drew forth his highest and holiest genius. From 1660 to 1674 he produced his matchless 'Paradise Lost' and 'Paradise Regained,' and his 'Samson Agonistes.' He addressed himself to these as a prophet would devote himself to his holy office. Five and twenty years had been spent in the sternest self-culture and sacred purpose, so that he thought his epic ideal a schooling from God. He had conceived the first plan of his 'Paradise Lost' under the flush and daring imaginations of youth, but dared not touch the work without the chaste and ripe judgment of fifty, and then considered himself poorly equipped for its execution. He was not content to create an epic fiction, much less a romance, but would deal

only in real poetic truth on foundations as firm as the eternal throne. But for all this he implored the help of heaven, as he believed that only close walk with God could give life and history to the imagery and feeling treasured in his soul. He said: 'This is not to be obtained but by devout prayer to that eternal Spirit that can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends forth his seraphim with the hallowed lire of his altar, to touch and purify the life of whom he pleases. To this must be added industrious and select reading, steady observation, and insight into all seemly and gracious acts and affairs; till which in some measure compact, I refuse not to sustain this expectation.' His blindness abandoned him to a sublime loneliness. Every thing material was banished from his fervid soul, while he sang to God the story of creation as 'the morning stars' sung it at first, and the greater story of redemption as it was sung by the advent angels. His soul was rapt because it breathed the air of a spiritual gospel and took the nourishment which a personal Christ imparts. His genius was overpowered by the sense of God's help, and this inspired his grace of movement, his glow of adoration. One of His most careful biographers writes that 'the horizon of "Paradise Lost" is not narrower than all space, its chronology not shorter than eternity; the globe of our earth a mere spot in the physical universe, and that universe itself a drop suspended in the infinite empyrean.' Butler says: 'It runs up into infinity.' The gorgeous embroidery which adorns 'Paradise Lost' is wanting in 'Paradise Regained,' clearly because he curbed his imagination in deference to evangelic truth. He could not gild the atoning cross without making the Gospel blush for the artist. The supernatural existences of 'Paradise Lost' are made visible in their darkness by the aid of superhuman lights; but 'Paradise Regained' shines in the native splendor of plain

gospel fact, it lives in the simplicity of Christ without bedecking, it extols the reign of grace without pomp. Christ is so fully its high art and argument, that Wordsworth pronounces it 'the most perfect in execution of any thing written by Milton,' and Coleridge, 'the most perfect poem extant' of its kind.

Milton's religious views were Non-conformist, but there is no decisive proof that he was a communicant of any Church. He said, 1642, that he was 'a member incorporate into that truth whereof I was persuaded, and whereof I had declared myself openly to be the partaker.' Again, in his 'Treatise on Christian Doctrine:' 'For my own part, I adhere to the Holy Scriptures alone. I follow no other heresy or sect. I had not even read any of the works of heretics, so called, when the mistakes of those who are reckoned for orthodox, and their incautious handling of Scripture, first taught me to agree with their opponents, whenever those opponents agree with Scripture.' A State religion was abhorrent to him, and he demanded equal rights for all sects, except Roman Catholics. These he would not tolerate in England, on the ground that Catholicism was a political machine, which had destroyed the liberties of England once, and, he believed, would destroy them again if it recovered ascendancy. He did not regard it as a religious but as a political system in a religious guise, directly opposed to civil freedom and, therefore, intolerable. Also, he was extremely jealous lest any sect should trench a hair's-breadth upon his personal rights of conscience; hence, he chose to follow his own individual lines. He adopted the same course in his literary, political, and official life, holding no close intimacy with leading literary men or republicans, not even with Cromwell. He said, in 1657: 'I have very little acquaintance with those in power, inasmuch as I keep very much to my own house, and prefer to do so.' In this

self-contained reserve he appears to have had no intercourse with the literati of the times, Waller, Herrick, Shirley, Davenant, Cowley, Gataker, Seldon, Usher or Butler, and seems not to have met most of them. The purely literary did not suit him, and with many of these he was in warm controversy.

Bishop Sumner states, that 'during every period of his life, his Sundays were wholly devoted to theology.' This was not merely a private exercise, for Buch shows that on Sundays he read a chapter of the Greek Testament, and gave an exposition of it to his pupils; and then, at his dictation, they wrote on divinity. This course not only nourished his own religious life, but made him a religious teacher to others, and he followed this order as well before he became blind as after. After 1660 he was so hated that the iron entered his soul, and he preferred to dwell in darkness; or as Macaulay forcibly expresses it: 'After experiencing every calamity which is incident to our nature, old, poor, sightless and disgraced, he retired to his hovel to die.'

And still it stands good, that he defended roundly, openly and with his might every distinctive principle which the Baptists hold, and his foes ranked him with them. In his youth he held Trinitarian views and in his 'Ode on Christ's Nativity' speaks of our Lord as,

'Wont at heaven's high council-table,
To sit the midst of Trinal Unity.'

In later life he was tainted with Arianism; yet, with a strange inconsistency, he constructed his 'Paradise Lost' on the fundamental principle of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, and maintains this truth without the least ambiguity or equivocation in his 'Treatise on Doctrine,' together with the co-related tenets of original sin, justification and regeneration. These were not distinctive Baptist doctrines in his day more than now; they were held in

common by Baptist and Pedobaptist. He held views on divorce which the Baptists of his day did not hold, growing out of his conviction that while marriage itself is an appointment of God, it should be known in human law only as a civil contract, a sentiment which is now incorporated into the statute law of the American States. But on all the doctrines which distinguish Baptists from other religious bodies, he stands an open and firm Baptist writer.

1. *As to the Rule of Faith.* Usher, the most learned prelate of his day in all that concerned religious tradition, was seriously perplexed and compelled to abandon some of his positions in his controversy with Milton. Milton swept away all his patristic arguments at a stroke, charging that the archbishop was not 'contented with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of the Gospel, as if the divine Scriptures wanted a supplement, and were to be eked out...by that indigested heap and fry of authors called antiquity.' He then avows: 'That neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself.' For this reason he refused to appeal to any authority but the Bible in his 'Treatise on Doctrine.' So rigidly did he adhere to his rule to 'discard reason in sacred matters,' that Bishop Sumner complains thus: 'Milton has shown a partiality in all his works, even on subjects not immediately connected with religion, for supporting his argument by the authority of Scripture;' and so the Bible was the mother of his prose and poetic literature. He took the exact Baptist ground of his day and ours, when he said: 'I enroll myself among the number of those who acknowledge the word of God alone as the rule of faith.'

2. *He took the highest Baptist ground on the constitution and government of a Gospel*

Church. He demanded that it must be a 'communion of saints,' a 'brotherhood professing the faith,' and that 'such only are to be accounted of that number as are well taught in Scripture doctrine, and capable of trying by the rule of Scripture and the Spirit any teacher whatever, or even the whole collective body of teachers.' Such a Church, he says, 'however small its numbers,' is an independent body: 'In itself an integral and perfect Church, so far as regards its religious rights nor has it any superior on earth, whether individual or assembly or convention, to whom it can be lawfully required to render submission.' Its offices, he held, are presbyters and deacons, and 'the choice of ministers belongs to the people.' This excludes all infant membership, on any plea. He protests of infants, that 'they are not to be baptized; inasmuch as they are incompetent to receive instruction, or to believe, or to enter into a covenant, or to promise or answer for themselves, or even to hear the word. For how can infants, who understand not the word, be purified thereby, any more than adults can receive edification by hearing an unknown language? For it is not that outward baptism, which purifies only the filth of the flesh, that saves us, but the answer of a good conscience, as Peter testifies, of which infants are incapable...Baptism is also a vow, and as such can neither be pronounced by infants nor be required of them.' No Baptist writer, of any period, more thoroughly refutes the doctrine of infant baptism than does Milton.

3. *As to the order of baptism itself, he holds it to be an ordinance under the Gospel:* 'Wherein the bodies of believers, who engage themselves to pureness of life, are immersed in running water, to signify their regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and their union with Christ, in his death, burial and resurrection.' It is in vain: alleged by those, who, on the authority of Mark 7:4, Luke 11:38, have introduced the practice of

affusion in baptism instead of immersion, that to dip and to sprinkle mean the same thing; since in washing we do not sprinkle the hands, but immerse them.' His writings abound in this sentiment. In 'Paradise Lost' (Book xii) he teaches that after Christ's resurrection he commissioned his Apostles

'To teach all nations what of him they learned,
And his salvation; them who shall believe
Baptizing in the profluent stream, the sign
Of washing them from guilt of sin to life
Pure, and in mind prepared, if so befall,
For death like that which the Redeemer died.'

4. *As we have already seen, he was a thorough Baptist on all that related to soul liberty,* excepting in the case of the Roman Catholics. His 'Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes' teaches: 'That for belief or practice in religion, no man ought to be punished or molested by any outward force upon earth whatsoever.' Again, in his 'Christian Doctrine:' 'The civil power has dominion only over the body and external faculties of man; the ecclesiastical is exercised exclusively on the faculties of the mind, which acknowledge no other jurisdiction.' He went further than Locke, who excluded atheists from toleration; for while he repudiated all union of Church and State, he held to a union between the State and religion, as such. With this one abatement of Catholic toleration, Milton stood with the Baptists on the liberty of conscience. Dr. Stoughton writes: 'The Baptists multiplied after the Revolution, and continued what they had been before, often obscure, but always stanch supporters of independence and voluntarism. In this respect they differed from Presbyterians, and often went beyond Independents.'

For these reasons, many of Milton's biographers have classed him with Baptists. Mark Pattison tells us, that 'every Philistine leveled the contemptuous epithet of Anabaptist

against Milton most freely. He says of himself, that he now lived in a world of disesteem. Nor was there wanting to complete his discomfiture the practical parody of the doctrine of divorce. A Mistress Attaway, lace-woman in Bell Alley and she-preacher in Coleman Street, had been reading Master Milton's book, and remembered that she had an unsanctified husband, who did not speak the language of Canaan. She further reflected that Mr. Attaway was not only unsanctified, but was also absent with the army, while William Jenney was on the spot, and, like herself, also a preacher.' This slant of the modern author accords exactly with the abuse of Milton by Featley, on the same subject, in 1644. In his 'Dippers Dipt,' he first attends to the case of Roger Williams, who had just issued his 'Bloody Tenet,' ranking him with the 'Anabaptists,' because he taught that 'it is the will and command of God, that since the coming of his Son, the Lord Jesus, a permission of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or antichristian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and countries. That civil States with their officers of justice are not governors or defenders of the spiritual and Christian state and worship. That the doctrine of persecution in case of conscience, maintained by Master Calvin, Beza, Cotton and the ministers of the New England Churches, is guilty of the blood of the souls crying for vengeance under the altar.' On the same page, and in the next sentence, he couples Milton with Williams as an 'Anabaptist' by the title of his book, saying: 'Witness a "Tractate of Divorce," in which the bonds of marriage are let loose to inordinate lust, and putting away wives for many other causes besides that which our Saviour only approveth, namely, in cases of adultery.'

Featley's design was to lampoon the Baptists, and if Milton was not understood to stand on their distinctive principles as well as

Williams, why did he run the risk of classing them all together and denouncing them in the same breath as Baptists? This furious writer hated both of them as well as their doctrine of soul-liberty, and the law of association led him to denounce them both as symbolizing with those who held this as a divine truth. Other men, whom he hated as much as these, had written books as distasteful to him, but he did not, therefore, class them with Baptists, merely to throw additional contempt upon them as a body; for even Featley had some sense. Milton's widow was a Baptist and a member of the Church at Nantwich, Cheshire, but it is not known when she entered its fellowship. Her body rests in the meeting-house of that Church, and she appointed Samuel Creton, its pastor, her 'loving friend,' as one of her executors. Perhaps this sketch cannot better be finished than by giving the following from John Tolland, who wrote the first 'Life of Milton,' published in London, 1699: 'Thus lived and died John Milton, a person of the best accomplishments, the happiest genius and the vastest learning which this nation, so renowned for producing excellent writers, could ever yet show...In his early days he was a favorer of those Protestants then opprobriously called by the name of Puritans. In his middle years he was best pleased with the Independents and Anabaptists, as allowing of more liberty than others and coming the nearest to his opinion to the primitive practice. But in the latter part of his life he was not a professed member of any particular sect among Christians; he frequented none of their assemblies, nor made use of their peculiar rites in his family. Whether this proceeded from a dislike of their uncharitable and endless disputes, and that love of dominion or inclination to persecution, which, he said, was a piece of popery inseparable from all Churches, or whether he thought one might be a good man without subscribing to any party,

and that they had all in some things corrupted the institutions of Jesus Christ, I will by no means adventure to determine; for conjectures on such occasions are very uncertain, and I have never met with any of his acquaintance who could be positive in assigning the true reasons for his conduct.'

Few men amongst the Baptists ranked higher at this period than BENJAMIN KEACH. He was born in 1640, was immersed on his faith in Christ at the age of fifteen, and began to preach at eighteen; then, in 1668, at the age of twenty-eight, he became pastor of the Baptist Church in Horsleydown, London. For the high crime of publishing a small work on fundamental Baptist principles he was indicted in 1664, and brought before Chief-Justice Hyde. This judge descended to the meanness of browbeating his prisoner. The indictment being long, Keach asked for a copy, that he might confer with counsel. This right of every English man was refused; and the judge, in a towering passion, demanded that he should first plead, or he would take his silence as confession, and so pronounce judgment. He pleaded 'Not Guilty,' when the judge gave him a copy and an hour's time to consider objections. This he declined as insufficient. When he proceeded to his defense the Court said: 'You shall not speak any thing here, except to say whether you wrote the book or not.' The jury found a technical error in the indictment, but the Court forced a verdict of guilty, despite the law. The judge then sentenced him to prison for two weeks, and to stand in the pillory in the market-place at Aylesbury, with a paper upon his head inscribed: 'For writing, printing and publishing a schismatical book, entitled "The Child's Instructor; or, A New and Easy Primmer."' At the same time he was to pay a fine of £20, to give sureties for his appearance at the next assize, to recant his doctrines, and his book was to be burnt before his eyes in the pillory by the

hangman. When in the pillory the crowd treated him with great respect, and, instead of hooting and pelting him with eggs, as was common, listened eagerly to his exhortations. The sheriff, in a great rage, threatened to gag him, but he exhorted the people out of the Bible. On the following Saturday he stood in the pillory at Winslow and his book was burnt. He was often in prison for preaching the Gospel, and had great contests with Baxter, Burkitt and Flavel on Baptist peculiarities. For many years his Church was compelled to meet in private houses but under the Declaration of Indulgence, 1672, they built their first house of worship, which was frequently enlarged until it held a thousand hearers.

Various controversies were rife amongst the Baptists of his day, this with others: Whether or not they should sing in public worship? Many Churches were much distracted on this subject. The Presbyterians sung certain cast-iron botches, called the translation of Sternhold and Hopkins, but these were denounced as 'human composures;' a self-evident truth. Even Beza's translation of David's Psalms was irreverently called, by both Baptists and Independents, 'Geneva Jiggs.' The Broadmead Records tell us that in 1675 it was proposed that Gifford's Church, at Bristol, with the Presbyterians and Independents, should all meet together for worship in trying times; but some of Gifford's flock, to show their dislike of metrical versions, reserved the right to 'keep on their hatts, or going forth' during this part of the service. Their brethren, however, would not sanction such disorder, and agreed that those who 'would not keep off their hatts and sitt still, should be desired to stay away.' The press groaned with pamphlets and books on this controversy. The contest was not as to whether the congregation should sing instead of a choir, but, at first, whether they would have any singing at all; and, secondly, if yes, whether the saints should

do it alone or the wicked should join in and help them. Keach was drawn into this controversy, and in 1691 published a book on the subject. He demonstrated his gravity of character by keeping a straight face while he solemnly proceeded to show 'that there are various kinds of voices; namely, (1) a shouting noise of the tongue; (2) a crying noise; (3) a preaching voice, or noise made that way; (4) a praying or praising voice; and (5) a singing voice.' He then declares in downright earnest that 'singing is not a simple heart singing, or mental singing; but a musical, melodious modulation or tuning of the voice... That singing is a duty performed always with the voice, and cannot be done without the tongue, etc.' He resolved to introduce singing into his Church, cost what it might. But he met with great opposition; and as his was the first Church amongst the Baptists to introduce singing, so far as now appears, it is interesting to know that it was first used at the Lord's Supper about 1673, and confined to communion occasions for about six years. Then the practice was extended to days of public thanksgiving, which practice continued about fourteen years. After about twenty years the Church, with some dissent, was persuaded to sing every Lord's day. But even then the brethren agreed only to sing at the close of the prayer after the sermon; and so tender were they of the consciences of the minority, that they passed a vote not to censure those who went out and stood in the chapel-yard, if they could not conscientiously stay in and hear the singing. Yet all this care made no matter. The anti-singing party left the Church, and established another body in every respect like the old Church, except as to singing. This was known then, and is now, as the Maze Pond Church. February 9th, 1693, Luke Leader, living in Tooley Street, Southwark, with six brethren and thirteen sisters, met to spend the day in fasting and prayer without a song in their

mouth, 'and to settle themselves in a Church state.' When they were gone Keach and his Church resolved to 'let their songs abound,' and on the 1st of March actually passed a vote 'that they who are for singing may sing as above said.' This new congregation continued songless until 1739, when Abraham West refused to become their pastor unless they would introduce singing into public worship, which they did. And now few congregations in London sing better or more lusty songs of praise than that on Old Kent Road, when a thousand people lift their voices high, in their new edifice, which cost them £13,000, and was dedicated by Dr. Landels. Other London Churches had hot conflicts on this singing question, the custom being, according to Taylor, 'for a long time,' for the discontented to go out of the congregation 'when the singing commenced.' And Dr. Russell says of the practice, in 1696: 'This way of singing has a tendency to your ruin, having begun already to diminish your numbers, and for two congregations to unite into one, to keep up their reputation and supply that deficiency which singing in rhyme has made in their numbers. Nay, further, a great part of your members that remain are so dissatisfied, that, as soon as you begin to tune your pipes, they immediately depart like men affrighted.' Possibly, with good reason, too.

This controversy caused most unlovely bickerings in the Churches, some few of them Independent, as well as Baptist. Concealed worship had first made silence necessary, to avoid persecution, till about 1680. The contest was prosecuted through numbers of books and pamphlets with great fierceness, the whole question turning on the one point, whether or not there was scriptural precept or example for the whole congregation, converted and unconverted, to join in the singing as a part of divine worship. Yet they all believed that such

persons as God had gifted to sing might do so, one by one; and in this form of solo all the Churches had singing, but only as the heart dictated the 'melody,' and not by the use of rhyme or written note.

Mr. Keach was a prolific author, having published forty-three different works, some of them large. He had great faith in God, and was the subject of many marked interpositions of his goodness. One striking fact is related of his later years. He was so ill in 1689 that life was despaired of, even by his physicians. Mr. Knollys, who greatly loved him, knelt at his bedside, and after fervently praying that God would add to his life the time granted to Hezekiah; on rising, said, 'Brother Keach, I shall be in heaven before you.' Both the prayer and prediction were honored to the letter; Knollys died two years afterward and Keach lived fifteen years.

For three generations the GIFFORDS were noted Baptist preachers. Andrew was the head of the family, and was highly esteemed in the west of England. He was born at Bristol, and entered the ministry in 1661, when persecution began to be very fierce. Many thrilling stories tell of his adventures and perils, some of which he escaped by boldness and ready wit, as well as by gentleness of spirit. While he was preaching at Bristol the mayor and aldermen came with the sword and other official regalia, and commanded him to come down. He told them that as he was about his Master's business, they would oblige him to wait until he was through, then he would go with them. They complied, sat down and listened with close attention; when he went with them to the council-house, where they gave him 'a soft reproof and caution,' and dismissed him. He was thrice imprisoned in Newgate, then a loathsome dungeon, and in many other ways suffered for the truth. He was drawn into the uprising of the ill-fated Duke of Moilmouth, but

escaped the legal consequences of his course; while Elizabeth Gaunt, a noble Baptist, was burned at Tyburn for giving refuge to a rebel of whom she had no knowledge, being prompted by humanity. But Jeffrys, whose meat and drink it was to sentence a Baptist to death, sent her to the stake on the oath of the outlaw whom she had ignorantly succored, and burnt her October 23d, 1685.

A second ANDREW GIFFORD, D.D grandson of the above, was born at Bristol in 1700. He was baptized at the age of fifteen. In 1729 he removed to London and formed the Eagle Street Church, which he served for fifty years. He was very learned and a powerful preacher. For the last thirty years of his life he was Assistant Librarian of the British Museum, a post which he filled with great honor.

The Hollis family was noted also for its preaching ability, although Thomas and John, its most distinguished members, remained in business while they preached. Thomas, the younger, was one of the most liberal supporters of Harvard College, Mass. In 1720 he founded a professorship of theology there, and in 1726 a professorship of mathematics and experimental philosophy, and sent over apparatus that cost £150. The first of these was endowed with a salary of £80 a year, with £10 each to ten scholars, four of whom were to be Baptists; the second professorship was to have the same salary, £80.

Probably the most learned man amongst the General Baptists at this period was Thomas Grantham. He became a pastor when very young, and was early called to suffer for conscience' sake in Lincoln jail. There he wrote a tract called 'The Prisoner against the Prelate,' in which he gave his reasons for separation from the Established Church. It is supposed that he wrote the Address or Confession which he put into the hand of Charles II, and which is chiefly of value for our purpose because it sets

forth that it was adopted by many representatives of the London Churches, and 'owned and approved by more than twenty thousand;' which shows the number of General Baptists at that time, and gives us an idea of their proportionate strength. If the Particular Baptists numbered ten thousand in 1662, as is supposed, this would give the entire Baptist strength of England at thirty thousand; which, together with their sympathizers, shows a strong element in the population, estimated at that time at three hundred thousand in London and from three to five millions in England. This fair estimate throws light upon the question of fear and hatred toward them in the State Church.

In the reign of Charles II the Rev. Francis Bampfield founded the body known as the Seventh-Day Baptists. He was a graduate of Oxford and a prebend of Exeter Cathedral, but in 1653 subscribed to the commonwealth, and took the Scriptures as his sole religious guide. The Act of Conformity in 1662 expelled him from his living, and, continuing to preach, he was cast into prison. But he preached in the jail-yard, then, being released, he was re-arrested and was imprisoned for eight years. Still he not only preached, but formed a Church within the prison walls. On his release he founded the first Sabbatarian Church in London, and became its pastor in 1676. Here he was declared out of the protection of his majesty, was condemned to jail during life or the king's pleasure, all his goods were forfeited, and he died in Newgate, February, 1684. This body of Baptists never was numerous in England, but a bequest having been left to the Church in Whitechapel, the property has now become very valuable. On the death of Dr. Black, its late learned pastor, the membership was reduced to about half a dozen old people, and the property was likely to revert to the crown by the conditions of the bequest. A Seventh-Day Baptist pastor could not be found

in Europe, and the vice-chancellor decided that, if the Seventh-Day brethren could not fill the place, the property would be lost to the Baptists. It was the happiness of the writer to open negotiations whereby an American was sent over to fill the place, and the Church is more prosperous today under the labors of Mr. Jones than it has been probably for a century.

The formation of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, was a movement in which the Baptists had some interest. The Continental and some of the English Baptists held peculiar views in regard to the lawfulness of judicial oaths, the bearing of arms – even in self-defense – the severance of Christians from the civil magistracy, simplicity of manners and plainness of dress. One by one they dropped these peculiarities, and the views adopted by George Fox were little more in the origin of the society than a modification of these austere Baptist positions. The principal point, however, on which Fox separated from the Baptists was the question of the 'inner light' by which a believer could discern between truth and error without the letter of Scripture. The Baptists admitted the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, whose function it was to interpret the written word, but to the Friends 'the leading of the Spirit' was the infallible authority, because the voice of God in the soul. It is an unquestionable historical fact that but for the Baptists of the two hundred years preceding, the Society of Friends would not have come into existence in 1648.

We have many traditions, but little written history of very early Baptist Churches in England, especially touching the date of their origin, their line of pastors, the number of their members, or the notable events of their history. We have some data, however, concerning a few Churches in the west of England. In Cornwall there were Baptist Churches as early as 1650. Forty ministers were ejected in Cornwall, in

1662, and a Baptist Church was gathered at East Looe, and another at Trelevah. The last, from which sprang the Church at Falmouth, was founded by Tregoss. He was educated at Oxford and settled at St. Ives, was ejected and suffered frequent imprisonment, until the king released him in 1671. We are more highly favored in the case of the Broadmead and Fenstanton Churches, the records of which are preserved, and other records may one day come to light. John Canne formed the Bristol Church in 1641, a body noted as the field of Robert Hall's labors in later years. Canne published the first English Bible with references, and it is worthy of his fame for learning and consecration to Christ, as well as for his labor in planting this living Church.

With the death of that faithless monarch, Charles II, in 1685, a brighter day dawned for the Baptists. On his deathbed he received the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church, though he had professed loyalty to the Church of England during his life. His disgraceful persecution of the Non-conformists had concealed his secret love for Rome; but when his brother, James II, ascended the throne, he avowed himself a Romanist, and the severity of persecution was relaxed. In the theory of the law, the Catholic was in the same category with the Independent and the Baptist as a Non-conformist. And as the Catholics must be treated with lenity, so must the others be, to make this lenity more easy to them. However much Protestants might oppress each other, they were a unit against Rome. Accordingly, when James issued his Declaration of Indulgence, in 1687, dispensing with penalties against dissenters, he was surprised to meet with remonstrance on all sides, and especially from Non-conformists, because they could not purchase religious liberty at the price of their civil freedom as Englishmen. The king had assumed to do away with all the religious

penalties on his own prerogative without law, and the dissenting bodies would not accept his toleration without law and contrary to law. James could not hoodwink them by his crafty policy, for they saw clearly enough, that when once the Catholics should gain sufficient power, the toleration which the king had granted to his own faith for a purpose would be withdrawn from others, and Protestant England would see sorrowful times. The Baptists joined the other Non-conformists in protesting against the illegal means by which their general liberty had been granted, while they used it freely as a right in spreading their faith. And they continued to resist James until the day that he was compelled to fly and William of Orange became the ruler of England. Both by training and conviction William was opposed to all persecution for religion, and the alliance of all but Catholics against James made his new policy easy. The continuous and determined efforts of Baptists, Quakers and some of the Independents for complete religious liberty had, by this time, been aided by the pen of Chillingworth, and even some of the English clergy were friendly thereto. But, perhaps, the fact that the policy of legal repression had been thoroughly tried and failed was the most potent consideration in the public mind. The land was sick and disgusted with the fiendish attempt to manacle conviction to men's souls by chains, and to fry heresy out of their consciences by flames.

Toleration was forced in England by the two branches into which the Independent Churches divided. They both agreed in the statement of the principle, but they differed in regard to its vigorous enforcement. Philip Nye and Thomas Goodwin suffered severely for toleration of a certain order, but Hanserd Knollys and Roger Williams suffered for absolute religious freedom, without any toleration or qualification whatever. Their ideal

Baptists of Great Britain

was that God has directly granted to man in his birth and nature the individual right of a free conscience, and no toleration of his conscience can be rightfully claimed or defended by his fellowman. Yet, the best defenders of toleration as against absolute religious freedom, such as Jeremy Taylor, Chillingworth and Locke, were obliged to base their pleas for toleration on the ground of a free conscience, but they stopped short of its full demand. And the result of the radical ground taken by the seventeenth and eighteenth century Baptists was not only the creation of new impulses in the struggles of religious liberty and a new type of human legislation, but the creation of a new conscience itself, which asserts to each man his right from God to this freedom.

The Toleration Act of 1689 is one of the great landmarks of English history, incomplete and mutilated as it appears to us now. It failed to place all Englishmen on an equality, and left many suffering civil disabilities for religious belief, but it was a long step forward, and substantially ended active persecution. The

Baptists now gave the fullest and freest information of their faith and practices in three notable Confessions, two respecting the General and one respecting the Particular Baptists. The General brethren issued the so called 'Orthodox Creed' in 1678, approved by their Churches in Bucks, Hereford, Bedford and Oxford, signed by fifty-four 'messengers, elders and brethren.' Its Arminianism is mild, and approaches moderate Calvinism. The Calvinistic Confession issued in 1677 and again in 1689, is decided, though not extreme in its doctrinal positions. Aside from distinctive Baptist principles, it is practically the Westminster Confession. Yet, in many things the Baptists stood entirely alone. Curteis calls them 'Puritans, pure and simple, the only really consistent and logically unassailable Puritans. If Puritanism is true, the Baptist system is right...For the maintenance of more strictly Calvinistic doctrines, for the exercise of a more rigorous and exclusive discipline, for the practice of a more literally scriptural ritual;' they were justified in standing alone.

Chapter 9 - British Baptists – Liberty of Conscience – Associations – The Stennetts – Irish Baptists

It has been stated that several 'Anabaptists' of London made a declaration against universal toleration in 1659, but the value of this statement is light as testimony because, even if the declaration is authentic, the names and number of its supporters are not known. Possibly, a few Baptists might have sided with Milton in proscribing the Catholics, but the weight of large treatises and several Confessions of large bodies of Churches put them, as a people, on unquestionable record to the contrary. With gratitude it may be written, that down to this day, no known Baptist has penned a sentence favoring the infliction of bodily pain or material penalty by civil government for the belief or practice of a purely religious tenet. On the contrary, with amazing unity Baptists have demanded the right for all men of absolute liberty of conscience in matters of duty to God, without any interference whatever. They stand so radically on the cardinal principle of personal responsibility to God, that to deny this absolute liberty would be to destroy themselves. Locke only chronicled their inner life in saying, that 'the Baptists were from the beginning friends and advocates of absolute liberty – just and true liberty – equal and impartial liberty.'

In 1609 certain Puritans petitioned for toleration, but disclaimed all 'way for toleration unto Papists, our suit being of a different nature from theirs,' and the English Independents asked for little more. Stoughton, in his late *Ecclesiastical History of England*, entirely agrees with Masson, in Baptist lead here. He writes: 'The Baptists were foremost in the advocacy of religious freedom, and perhaps, to one of them, Leonard Basher, citizen of London, belongs the honor of presenting, in this country, the first distinct and broad plea for liberty of conscience.' This comprehensive

book, indeed, covers the subject so forcefully, that scarcely a new thought has been added to its treatment since 1614. It maintains that it is 'lawful for every person or persons, yea, Jews and Papists, to write, dispute, confer, and reason, print and publish any matter touching religion, either for or against whomsoever;' that 'it is irrational to persecute any man for religion, because faith is the gift of God to each man, which neither bishop nor king can command, to make Christians by force.' He pronounces it 'unnatural and abominable, yea, monstrous for one Christian to destroy another for difference and questions of religion.'

So ringingly does this book present the doctrine of the nineteenth century, that Masson says, 'It cannot be read now without a throb;' and speaking of Helwys's Church, with which he as well as Barclay connects Basher, he uses this strong language: 'His Baptist congregation maintained itself in London side by side with Jacob's congregation of Independents, established in 1616.' As if to signalize still further the discrepancy of the two sets of sectaries on the toleration point, there was put forth in that very year, by Jacob and the Congregationalists, a 'Confession of Faith,' containing this article: 'We believe that we, and all true visible Churches, ought to be overseen, and kept in good order and peace, and ought to be governed under Christ, both supremely and also subordinately, by the civil magistrate; yea, in causes of religion, when need is.' 'A most humble supplication' from the Baptists to Charles I, 1620, opposes all kinds of religious persecution. Still, when Chillingworth sided with the Baptists on soul-liberty, in 1637, he stood alone in the Church of England. The eight Churches, 1643, laid down this doctrine with the clearness and fullness of an American Bill of Rights today, in Article XLVII of their

Confession. Featley's wrath boiled over at its radical utterances, and devout Baxter protested: 'I abhor unlimited liberty and toleration of all, and think myself easily able to prove the wickedness of it.' But the Baptist idea spread against all resistance. Treatise after treatise came from the Baptist press in its defense, until one hundred 'baptized congregations' formulated it in Article XXI, of what is now known as the Confession of 1689, although Crosby claims that it was only republished in that year, and that the first edition was issued in 1677. It says: 'God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word or not contained in it. So that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands, out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith and absolute and blind obedience is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also.'

Nor were the General Baptists a whit behind their Calvinistic brethren on this subject. They issued their belief in 'An Orthodox Creed or a Protestant Confession of Faith,' 1678, in which Article XLV says: 'Subjection in the Lord ought to be yielded to the magistrates in all lawful things commanded by them, for conscience' sake, with prayers for them for a blessing upon them, paying all lawful and reasonable customs and tribute to them, for the assisting of them against foreign, domestical and potent enemies.' Then, the next Article, after fully setting forth that Christ is the only King of conscience, and that no man can hold it in 'usurpation,' declares: 'Therefore, the obedience to any demand or decree, that is not revealed in, or (is) consonant to his word, in the holy oracles of Scripture, is a betraying of the true liberty of conscience. And the requiring of an implicit faith and a blind obedience destroys liberty of conscience and reason also, it being repugnant to both.' The

'Westminster Confession,' 1648, Chapter XX, says in substance the same thing; but in the same chapter it maintains that as matters 'concerning faith, worship...or such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing and maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church; they may be lawfully called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church, and by the power of the civil magistrate.' Then, of the duty of the civil magistrate himself, Chapter XXIII says: 'It is his duty to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline be prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed.' Such hybrid liberty of conscience as this may account for the fact, that when the Presbyterians had the ascendancy in the Assembly and Parliament, 1648, a statute was passed inflicting imprisonment upon those who held 'that the baptism of infants is unlawful and void, and that such persons ought to be baptized again.' The same ordinance inflicted 'the pains of death,' 'without benefit of clergy,' upon other heretics therein mentioned. Keal pronounces this law 'one of the most shocking laws I have met with in restraint of religious liberty,' and shows, 'that the governing Presbyterians would have made a terrible use of their power, had they been supported by the sword of the civil magistrate.' Whatever else this contradictory teaching of the Westminster Confession may prove; it fully supports Professor Masson in saying, that neither the Presbyterians nor the Independents of that period had any proper notion of absolute or universal toleration, much less of perfect liberty, that they were mere learners in that school, and were far behind 'the

old Baptists in their views.' He is not choice of his words here, but says squarely:

'As a body, the Presbyterians of 1644 were absolute Anti-tolerationists. The proofs are so abundant, collectively they make such an ocean, that it passes comprehension how the contrary could ever have been asserted. From the first appearance of the Presbyterians in force, after the opening of the Long Parliament, it was their anxiety to beat down the rising idea of Toleration; and after the meeting of the Westminster Assembly, and the publication of the "Apologetical Narration" of the Independents, the one aim of the Presbyterians was to tie Toleration around the neck of Independency, stuff the two struggling monsters into one sack, and sink them to the bottom of the sea.' In 1648 Cradock, the Independent, used language quite as strong, saying: 'I know also by the way that there are a company of people that would arrogate the name of Presbyterie though improperly. The name doth not beseeem them, that is, those that have been the Bishop's creatures and are all for fire and fagot; there are some such among us and they would arrogate the name of Presbytery; I would not have them do it, it doth not befit them.'

When we come to trace the effects of Toleration on the English Baptists, after it was procured, we see at once the paralyzing result of false doctrine, and their decline in spiritual power. This is nowhere more distinctly visible than in their Associations and General Assemblies. The insidious leaven of centralization had even worked itself into the later notions of Smyth, and the fifth charge on which Minton and Helwys expelled him in Holland was his teaching, 'that an elder in one Church is an elder of all Churches in the world.' A tinge of interchurch authority crept into the Confession of the eight Churches, 1643, in these words: 'Although the particular congregations be distinct and several bodies...they are to have counsel and keep one of another, if necessity require it, as members

of one body in the common faith, under Christ their head.' The paternal principle of Associations was laid down here, with a slight margin for its abuse also. An Association was formed in 1653, when the Somerset Churches, with those of Wilts, Devon, Gloucester and Dorset, met at Wells, 'on the sixth and seventeenth days of the month.' This body of Particular Baptists published the 'Somerset Confession' in 1656, which is not to be confounded with the 'Somerset Confession' issued by the General Baptists in 1691. The Midland Association of Particular Baptists was formed in 1655, at Warwick, but was reconstructed in 1690, and still exists; its original record books, however, are lost.

The Associations very early encroached on the rights of the Churches. Adam Taylor describes their business thus: 1. The reformation of inconsistent and immoral conduct, in ministers and private Christians; 2. The suppression of heresy; 3. Reconciling of differences between members and Churches; 4. Giving advice in difficult cases to individuals and Churches; 5. Proposing plans of usefulness; 6. Recommending cases requiring pecuniary support; 7. Devising means to spread the Gospel in the world at large, but especially in their own Churches. The first four of these would not be tolerated amongst us, and the desire for a stronger bond than that of mutual love soon brought them into serious trouble. The General Baptists experienced this, first, by establishing a 'General Assembly,' it is not certain at what precise date, but before 1671. It met only on 'emergent occasions,' on an average, once in two years. Article XXXIX of the 'Orthodox Creed' claims that it had 'divine authority, and is the best means under heaven to preserve unity, to prevent heresy, and superintendence among, or in any congregation whatsoever, within its limits of jurisdiction.' Appeals were made to this assembly 'in case

any injustice be done, or heresy and schism is countenanced in any particular congregation of Christ,...and such General Assemblies have lawful powers to hear and determine, and also to excommunicate.' Here, the independent polity of Baptist Churches was merged into a form of presbytery, and its disastrous effects soon became apparent.

The first 'General Assembly' of the Particular Baptists was held in 1689, on a call from the London Churches, signed by Kiffin, Knollys and Keach, with three others. The request was for 'a general meeting here in London of two principal brethren, of every Church of the same faith...in every county respectively.' This body is merely what is now known as an 'Association,' and it 'disclaimed all manner of superiority or superintendency over the Churches,' on the ground, that it had 'no authority or power to prescribe or impose any thing upon the faith and practice of any of the Churches of Christ, their whole intendment being to be helpers together of one another, by way of counsel and advice.' At its fourth meeting in May, 1692, there were one hundred and seven associated Churches, and the Assembly voted: 'That no Churches make appeals to them to determine matters of faith or fact; but propose, or query for advice.' At this time, the General Baptists had fallen into great trouble by making their Assembly a court of appeals, and the Particular Baptists resolved to take warning and escape that fate. For some cause, which does not appear, the London Churches dropped out of the Assembly after 1694, but the country Churches continued to meet, down to 1730, and the records of their meetings are still preserved.

Another body, called indifferently the 'London Association' and 'Assembly,' was organized in 1704, by delegates from thirteen Churches. At its first meeting it gave a most decided condemnation to Antinomianism. The

doctrine of Tobias Crisp disturbed the Baptists at that time, as well as the Presbyterians and Independents; which doctrine was in substance, that God could lay nothing to the charge of an elect person, on the ground of Christ's righteousness imputed to him; hence, he lived in complete sanctification, although he committed much sin. On this subject the Assembly said: 'That the doctrine of sanctification by the imputation of the holiness of Christ's nature, does, in its consequences, render inherent holiness by the Holy Spirit unnecessary, and tends to overthrow natural as well as revealed religion.' This was in no sense, however, a judicial decision to be followed by discipline, in case it were rejected, but as 'the opinion of the Assembly.' The supposed strong government of the General Baptist Assembly brought them into conflict with an eminent Sussex pastor, of learning and piety, concerning his views of the nature of Christ; one Matthew Caffyn. Mr. Wright charged him with defective views touching our Lord's divinity, and he satisfied the Assembly that he was sound on that subject, and also on the doctrine of the Trinity. But Wright saw an implied rebuke in the Assembly's exoneration of Caffyn, and withdrawing from the Assembly, he began to agitate the matter amongst the Churches. Caffyn was led into public controversy, and after a while, ran into teachings substantially Arian. Thus two parties sprang up, and four times the Assembly was disturbed with contention until, in 1698, Caffyn's doctrines were declared heretical, in consequence of which some Churches seceded and formed another General Association. This breach was never healed. Thus, the Presbyterian powers assumed by the Assembly failed to prevent either heresy or schism; as might have been expected, and by 1750 a majority of the General Baptists became Anti-Trinitarians. The Assembly continues to this day, meets every

Whitsuntide, the shadow of its former self, and is still Anti-Trinitarian.

But, decline amongst the Particular Baptists was very marked also. Antinomianism and hyper-Calvinism struck the Churches with a blight that was fatal not only to their growth, but often to their existence. Calvinism had taken a most repulsive form, which presented God in a severe and magisterial light only, and which led men to look upon him with distrust, as oppressive and unjust. True, all England was in a state of religious stagnation. Worldliness characterized the Church and infidelity was rampant; the Stuart period was bearing its natural fruit, and the Baptists went down in the scale with the rest. Under persecution they multiplied on every side, and for a time toleration almost killed them. Yet, even then there were found amongst them men of consecration, learning and zeal.

Dr. JOHN GALE was one of these, whose name has come down to us with great honor. Though an Englishman by birth, he was educated at Leyden, possibly because Dissenters could not then take degrees at the English Universities. At the age of nineteen he became a Doctor in Philosophy, and after studying at Amsterdam, under Limborch, in 1705 he became assistant pastor of the Church in Paul's Alley, Barbican. With his accomplishments in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, history and divinity, he was a powerful preacher, who possessed great refinement of religious feeling. Wilson says: 'His voice was clear and melodious; his style perspicuous, easy and strong; his method exact; his reasoning clear and convincing; and his deportment in the pulpit easy, yet accompanied with a seriousness and solemnity becoming the work in which he was engaged. He had an almost irresistible power over the passions, which he ever used agreeably to reason, and directed to the profit and advantage of his hearers.' But he died in his

forty-first year. He is best known to us by his 'Reply to Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism.' This reply is a specimen of candid scholarship seldom met with in the annals of religious controversy.

But the man who made the deepest mark upon the Baptists of his time was JOHN GILL, a native of Kettering, Northamptonshire, born in 1697. Very early in life he gave evidence of exceptional gifts, and his friends tried in vain to secure his admission to one of the Universities; but under private teachers he became a superior scholar in Latin, Greek and logic. He was baptized when nineteen and entered the ministry at twenty three. After the death of Benjamin Stinton, successor to Keach, in Horsleydown, John Gill was proposed as Stinton's successor, but on putting the question to vote a majority rejected him, when his friends withdrew and formed the Church afterward located in Carter Lane, Tooley Street, March 22, 1719, and on the same day he became its pastor. Gill's party worshiped for some years in the school-room of Thomas Crosby, the historian, until Reach's Church, which they had left, built a new chapel in Unicorn Yard, when they went to the old chapel in Goat Street, which Keach's people had ceased to use. Here the doctor preached until 1757, when they built for him a new meeting-house in Carter Lane, where he continued until his death in 1771. After many years of study he became a profound scholar in the Rabbinical Hebrew and a master of the Targum, Talmuds, the Rabboth and the book Zohar, with their ancient commentaries. He largely assisted Dr. Kennicottm his collation, and published a dissertation concerning the antiquity of the Hebrew language, etc. He was a prolific author, producing amongst many other weighty works, his 'Cause of God and Truth,' his 'Body of Divinity,' and his learned 'Commentary on the Bible.' Toplady, his intimate friend, says of

him, that

'If any man can be supposed to have trod the whole circle of human learning, it was Dr. Gill...It would, perhaps, try the constitutions of half the literati in England, only to read with care and attention the whole of what he said. As deeply as human sagacity enlightened by grace could penetrate, he went to the bottom of every thing he engaged in...Perhaps no man, since the days of St. Austin, has written so largely in defense of the system of grace, and, certainly, no man has treated that momentous subject, in all its brandies, more closely, judiciously and successfully.' He was also a great controversialist as well as a scholar. On this subject Toplady adds: 'What was said of Edward the Black Prince, that he never fought a battle that he did not win; what has been remarked of the great Duke of Marlborough, that he never undertook a siege which he did not carry, may be justly accommodated to our great philosopher and divine.'

And yet, with all his ability, he was so high a supralapsarian, that it is hard to distinguish him from an Antinomian. For example, he could not invite sinners to the Saviour, while he declared their guilt and condemnation, their need of the new birth; and held that God would convert such as he had elected to be saved, and so man must not interfere with his purposes by inviting men to Christ. Under this preaching his Church steadily declined, and after half a century's work he left but a mere handful. He did not mean to teach Antinomianism, and yet, in 1755, he republished Dr. Crisp's works, which had given rise to so much contention, with explanatory notes, defending Crisp from the charge of Antinomianism, although his doctrines had fallen like a mildew upon the Churches of the land, and none now pretend that Crisp was a safe teacher.

JOHN RIPPON succeeded Dr. Gill as pastor at Carter Lane. He was born in Tiverton, Devonshire, April, 1751, and at sixteen became

a servant of Christ. At seventeen he entered Bristol Academy, and at twenty-one became pastor in London, filling the same pastorate sixty-three years, or till 1836. Not so learned or profound as Gill, his preaching was fuller of life and affection, so that for years his Church was the largest of the Baptist faith in the metropolis, numbering four hundred members. He was extremely judicious and popular. He prepared a selection of one thousand one hundred and seventy-four hymns, which were used in his congregation to the day of Mr. Spurgeon, his successor, who revised and uses it still. Rippon also established and conducted the 'Baptist Register,' a monthly, from 1790 to 1802. He founded almshouses in Carter Lane, but when London Bridge was erected in 1832, they were removed to make way for its approaches. He died in 1836, aged eighty-five, and sleeps in Bunhill Fields.

This period is noteworthy for the STENNETT FAMILY. Dr. Edward was a physician, born A.D. 1663. In the reign of Charles II he dwelt in the castle at Wallingford, Berkshire. Regardless of danger he preached regularly, and his great ability as a physician led the gentlemen of the neighborhood to shield him from calamity.

His son, JOSEPH STENNETT, became a Christian early in life under the instructions of his parents. They gave him a good education in philosophy, the liberal sciences and languages, as French, Italian, the Hebrew and other tongues. In 1690 he became pastor of the Seventh-Day Baptist Church, meeting in Pinner's Hall, London, and labored there until his death, 1713. He ranked as a leader in the ministry for piety, eloquence and authorship. When William III escaped assassination, Mr. Stennett drew up an able address of congratulation for the Baptists, and presented it to the king; and Queen Anne sent him a present in acknowledgment of his thanksgiving sermon

for the victory of Hochstedt. He published three octavo volumes of sermons, a version of Solomon's Song, a translation from the French of the 'Discoveries by the Spaniards in America,' with many hymns on the ordinances and other subjects. Tate, the poet laureate, commended his poetry; and Sharp, Archbishop of York, desired him to revise the English version of the Psalms. Promotion was tendered him in the English Church, which he declined, for he was a sincere Baptist and remained amongst his own people. In 1702 David Russen wrote a little book against the Baptists, which attack Mr. Stennett answered, with uncommon dignity and learning. He took the measure of his foe from the start, and something of his style may be seen in the opening paragraph of his preface. 'If the author of the book to which this is an answer (who always affects to be thought very learned and sometimes abundantly witty) had only looked down upon the Anabaptists with that contempt with which they are used to be treated, and had barely diverted himself with the ignorance and folly he pretends to find among them, I should scarcely have given him or myself the trouble of an answer; for this treatment would have rendered them not so much the object of hatred as of compassion. But when his divertisement is cruel, and while he throws firebrands, arrows and death, he seems to be mightily satisfied with the sport. I hope none can justly blame me for endeavoring to turn aside the edge of his reproaches by a modest defense. For as little sense as the "Anabaptists" have, they can feel when their reputation is wounded; and as ignorant as they are, they have learned of the wisest of men to value a good name more than precious ointment, especially when they believe that to be the truth which is struck at through their sides under the character of a fundamental error.'

This frank courtesy and urbanity never

forsook him in the discussion, while he vindicated the truth with a giant's hand. So sweet was his spirit and so dignified his manner, that when his grandson proceeded to a similar work, many years afterward, he begged that his grandfather's mantle might fall upon him, saying: 'The example of a much honored ancestor, who has not only done singular justice to the argument itself, but, in the management of it, has shown a noble superiority to the rudest and most indecent invectives, that were, perhaps, ever thrown out against any set of men professing Christianity.' Joseph Stennett's work on Baptism had great influence in its day. It was of him that Danton wrote the doggerel:

'Stennett the patron and the rule of wit,
The pulpit's honor and the saint's delight.'

The second JOSEPH STENNTETT, and the third preacher in the family, was the son of the above-named, and was also a Seventh-Day Baptist. He was born in London in 1692, and died in 1758. He was thoroughly educated, united with the Church at sixteen, and became pastor of the Church at Exeter at the age of twenty-two. When he was forty-five he succeeded his father as pastor of the Church in Little Wild Street, London, a Church which attained great note in the denomination. He was highly honored in the metropolis as a man of large attainments and many graces of character. The Duke of Cumberland submitted his name to the University of Edinburgh, in 1754, for the degree of Doctor of Divinity, which honor was granted. Onslow, the Speaker of Parliament, Gibson, the Bishop of London, and several of the ministry of George II, numbered him amongst their personal friends; and he enjoyed the full confidence of the Baptist, Presbyterian and Independent pastors of London, in whose behalf he submitted an address to the king. He had two sons, members of his Church, and in turn both of them became his assistants in the

pastorate. The eldest, the third Joseph Stennett, and the fourth preacher in the line, became his father's assistant April 2, 1740, and served in that capacity for two years and a half, when he settled as pastor of the Baptist Church of Coate, Oxfordshire. Little is known of him beyond this.

SAMUEL STENNETT, his brother, was the fifth and most famous in this preaching family. He was born in Exeter in 1727, was educated under all the advantages of the day and became eminent for his knowledge of the Greek, Latin and Oriental languages, and of sacred literature in general. This ability, with great consecration to God, suavity of manner, cheerfulness of spirit and purity of heart, secured for him the universal love of his brethren. The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon him by the University of Aberdeen, in 1763. He had been immersed by his father at Exeter before he came to London, and became a member of the Church in Little Wild Street. In order to avoid perplexity, it may be desirable to give a brief sketch of this Church. It was one of a community of branches forming but one Church and meeting in various places. Prior to 1691 they were all Arminian, but in that year this branch declared itself independent and Calvinistic, and bought the chapel in Little Wild Street. This building had a curious history. The Portuguese had first occupied it for Roman Catholic worship, and the Spanish ambassador for the same purpose, after which it fell into the hands of the Baptists; but it was rebuilt in 1788. The Baptist Church worshiping here was never a Seventh-Day body, although it was served so long by the Stennetts, who were Sabbatarians in their personal faith. Sometimes a Sabbatarian Church used an ordinary Baptist chapel on Saturday, and oftener a non-Sabbatarian minister took the morning or afternoon service at a Sabbatarian place, and also at an ordinary Baptist church on

Sunday. On this plan Samuel Stennett, who was invited to become pastor of the Seventh-Day Church which his father and grandfather had served, but who did not accept the office, yet preached and administered the ordinances to that Church for many years.

The minutes of this Church say, that at a meeting held July 30, 1747, 'having had several trials of the gifts of Brother Samuel Stennett, and having heard him preach this evening, it is agreed that he be called out into the public service of the ministry.' A year later he was chosen assistant pastor, and ten years after this, being then thirty-one years of age, he was ordained to succeed his father as pastor. On entering the pastorate he said to his Church, 'I tremble at the thought.' Dr. Gill and Mr. Walling preached at his ordination, June 1, 1758, and he remained as pastor for forty-seven years, during which he was eminent for zeal, discretion, and learning. He also stood foremost amongst the champions of religious liberty. On this subject William Jones, the historian, says: 'He wisely concluded that whilst oppressive statutes were suffered to remain as part of the law of the land, there could be no security against their proving at some future time a handle for persecution. The doctor's judicious publications upon these subjects cannot fail to keep alive a grateful recollection of his talents, and to endear his name to posterity.' Allusion is here made to his two works, appealing to Parliament for the repeal of all persecuting laws. Dr. Winter said of him: 'To be able in the line of his ancestry to trace some, who, for the cause of liberty and religion, had quitted their native country, and their temporal possessions at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he accounted a far higher honor than to be the offspring of nobles or of monarchs.'

We have his non-controversial works in three octavo volumes, together with a large number of his well-known hymns; such as,

'What wisdom, majesty and grace,' 'To Christ, the Lord, let every tongue' (altered in modern versions so as to begin with the third verse, 'Majestic sweetness,' etc.), and 'On Jordan's stormy banks I stand.' This last hymn appeared to have been written in 1787, the year in which Rippon commenced his 'Selections.' Rippon was personally acquainted with Stennett, for they were Baptist pastors together in London from 1773 to 1795, and in the fourth edition of his 'Selections,' published about the last-named year, this hymn is found in its original form, 'On Jordan's stormy banks,' as it is found in all the English editions down to our day. The first variation therefrom, so far as the writer is aware, is found in an American edition of the 'Christian Psalmist,' New York, 1850. Forgetting that Stennett alluded to the Jordan at Jericho, described in Josh. 3, its compilers mistook him as describing its literal banks, instead of using a bold metonymy, which speaks of the banks for what they contain; namely, waters in vehement commotion; and so they tamed him down to their own conceptions, and to 'rugged banks.' About half a dozen American compilers have retained this namby-pamby innovation, for which they might as well have used stony banks or muddy banks; for the inner and outer banks of the Jordan at that spot are both. But Spurgeon, Rippon's successor, in re-editing the old hymn book (under the name of 'Our Own Hymn-Book') which has been used in Rippon's congregation from his day, says (1866): 'The hymns have been drawn from the original works of their authors, and are given, as far as practicable, just as they were written;' and so he retains Stennett's original form, 'stormy banks,' and with it his inspiring figure. Will the reader pardon this digression, for Baptists should be the last to slaughter their own hymnists in their singing.

The ministry of Samuel Stennett in Little Wild Street was peculiarly fascinating to large

minds. There he immersed the renowned Dr. Joseph Jenkins, Caleb Evans, afterward President of Bristol College, and Rev. Joseph Hughes, the founder of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Halloway, the noted engraver, sat under his ministry also; and John Howard, the immortal philanthropist, was a member of his congregation for many of the last years of his life. When Howard was young he met with an Independent congregation at Stoke Newington. But in 1756 or 1757 he took up his residence at Cardington, about three miles southeast of Bedford, and the same distance from Elstow, Bunyan's birthplace. For a considerable time he worshiped in the congregation where Gifford and Bunyan had been pastors, then under the pastoral charge of Joshua Symonds, with whom he became intimate. At that time this Church had a rupture, in which the Pede-baptist portion of the congregation withdrew and formed a new one, Howard going with them, and contributing liberally to the erection of a new meeting-house. In 1777 Howard's sister died and bequeathed to him a house in London, and from that time he spent much of his life in that city, and attached himself to Dr. Stennett's congregation, aiding largely in rebuilding the chapel.

In Stennett's funeral sermon for the great philanthropist, he quotes from a letter which Howard had written to him in Smyrna, in which he says: 'The principal reason of my writing is most sincerely to thank you for the many pleasant hours I have had in reviewing the notes I have taken of the sermons I have had the happiness to hear under your ministry. These, sir, with many of your petitions in prayer, have been and are my songs in the house of my pilgrimage. With unabated pleasure I have attended your ministry; no man ever entered more into my religious sentiments, or more happily expressed them. It was some little disappointment when any one else entered the pulpit. How many

Sabbaths have I ardently longed to spend in Wild Street; on these days I generally rest, or, if at sea, keep retired in my little cabin. It is you that preach, and, I bless God, I attend with renewed pleasure.'

In the funeral sermon preached for him by Stennett, he avows that Howard 'was not ashamed of those truths he heard stated, explained and enforced in this place; he had made up his mind, as he said, upon his religious sentiments, and was not to be moved from his steadfastness by novel opinions obtruded on the world...You know, my friends, with what seriousness and devotion he attended, for a long course of years, on the worship of God among us.' Howard alludes to the character of the truths enforced by Stennett, saying: 'No man ever entered more into my religious sentiments, or more happily expressed them.' In addition to the foundation principles of the Gospel held by Howard, Stennett preached the distinctive principles of the Baptists, in their roundest form, and to these Howard listened 'for a long course of years,' truths very distasteful to others. Dr. Winter says, that Stennett had none of that 'cool indifference to religious principles, which under the specious names of candor and liberality has too much prevailed amongst many modern Christians.' Stennett also speaks of Howard's great 'candor,' and of his 'having met with difficulties in his inquiries after truth.' Concerning the subjects of this struggle in Howard's mind, neither of them informs us, but as Howard had always been an orthodox Dissenter on principle, and that Stennett 'happily expressed' his own religious sentiments, the fair inference is, that he had adopted Stennett's Baptist views.

Many of the ablest Independent pastors preached the common doctrines held by Stennett, and notably amongst them Dr. Addington, of Miles Lane. He forced Stennett into a controversy with him on Baptism, by

violently attacking his principles. The latter's masterly reply filled two volumes, and if Howard did not sympathize in these sentiments, it is hard to understand the bearing of his own words, or why he listened to Stennett 'for a long course of years.' When Howard lived at Stoke Newington, his only son was christened as a babe, and at Bedford he left Symond's congregation because he would not baptize babes, giving £400 toward building a new meeting-house there, where infant baptism should be practiced, all of which shows that he had a stout conscience on the subject at that time. But when he removed to London, he not only contributed liberally to build a Baptist chapel for a man who all his life repudiated infant baptism, with all his heart, as a radical element of popery, but 'for a long course of years' he statedly turned his back on places of worship where it was practiced, helping to build up those of the contrary order. On this subject Stennett says: 'With what cheerfulness he assisted in the building of this house (Little Wild Street) you need not be told. He accounted it an honor, he said, to join his name with yours.' All this indicates a serious change in Howard's mind on the subject in question, and possibly, the shameful wickedness of his only son had shaken his confidence in infant baptism as a divine institution. Without some such change, Stennett would scarcely have used this strong language: 'He was not ashamed of those truths he heard stated, explained and enforced in this place.'

We have already seen that the Baptists of this period had much in common with the Society of Friends of our own times, while they had many quaint customs peculiar to themselves. In public worship the men and women sat on opposite sides of the house, the exhorting and 'prophesying' being prompted as the 'Spirit moved.' The Baptists, however, held to an ordained ministry and the need of the

ordinances. Ordination was made a serious matter, and was accompanied with the laying on of hands, fasting and prayer, and the power to confer it was lodged in the individual Church. They knew nothing of our modern Councils for Ordination, but commonly, as a mere matter of courtesy, invited neighboring pastors, not as representatives of other Churches, but on their personal kindness, to take part in the public recognition services. This is still the English practice, the American Council representing other Churches being unknown there.

The marriage service amongst them was similar to that of the 'Friends' of today. They rejected the rites of the Prayer-Book and the Established clergy refused to marry them. They devised a public service of their own, therefore, in which the parties took each other by mutual consent, without the aid of a minister. After due notice the couple stood up before the congregation, holding each other's hand, and publicly took each other for husband and wife. They then drew up a contract, or certificate of marriage, and signed it, and the persons present attested it as witnesses. An exhortation was given, a prayer was offered, and the solemnity was ended. Such marriages were legal until the Marriage Act of 1753, which exempted them only in the case of Quakers and Jews, while Baptists were compelled to seek legal marriage in the Episcopal Church.

The imposition of hands was practiced in the election of deacons, and quite generally in connection with baptism, especially amongst the General Baptists, this question being a disturbing element in many congregations. Fasting also was esteemed a religious duty, but no set times were appointed for its performance. The question of feet-washing was a dividing question, and for a time this usage was practiced in some of the Churches, generally meeting stout resistance; it soon

disappeared. The anointing of the sick was quite common, being approved by the example of Kiffin and Knollys, but physicians were not pushed aside, while prayer and oil were used for the recovery of the sick.

As with the Friends, 'marrying out of the Society' was strictly forbidden, and was followed by excommunication. The amusements of church members were carefully supervised. The old records give numerous instances of discipline for card-playing, dancing, cock-fighting and playing at foot-ball. A 'flourishing apparel' was condemned, and what is now known as the Quaker costume was worn by the Baptists, and borrowed by the Friends. Some matters in domestic life, as between husbands and wives, servants and masters, were subjects of discipline. Borrowing and lending, 'idleness in their calling,' 'covetousness,' 'lying and slandering,' 'obstinacy of temper,' 'negligence and extravagance,' came under disciplinary offenses.

They also fell into other customs of doubtful Bible authority. We learn from several sources that it was not uncommon to choose deacons and even pastors by the casting of lots. The Warboys Church elected both a deacon and elder in this way in the year 1647. But a more curious instance occurred in 1682, when Bampffield and his people wished to select a site for a chapel. They could not agree which to take out of three places. Therefore they laid aside their own prudential determinings, and after they had sought the Lord to choose for them, did refer the determining of it wholly unto him. Lots were prepared, one for each place, 'and that they might not limit the sovereign will of the All-wise, a fourth blank. Having agreed upon one to draw the lot, they all looked up to the God of heaven, expecting his allotment. The lot, being opened, spoke Pinner's Hall.' This custom was common amongst various Puritan sects in the

seventeenth century.

Many of the Churches observed love-feasts before the Lord's Supper, but as this early practice was not held to be obligatory and perpetual, it never became general, nor was it recognized in their Confessions. But great stress was laid upon the care of the poor in the Churches, and for this there was especial need in consequence of persecution. Heavy fines and long imprisonments despoiled their substance, tore husbands and wives apart, and brought starvation to their children, besides disinheriting them for their father's religious views when he was dead. This drove them to consider themselves as one great family, in which the strong should help the weak, and created a sort of voluntary communism amongst them. It was a standing rule in some Churches for each member to make his contribution to the treasury every Sunday, and so by plainness and economy each lived for the other, and in times of calamity all gave a willing response to the needy.

Ministerial clubs became a curious feature amongst the Baptists. One, composed of Calvinistic ministers, was organized as early as 1714, and met weekly at a London coffee-house. The rent of a room in which one club had been held was four guineas a year, but it was raised sixteen shillings 'in consideration of the rise of tobacco,' a side-light on the doings of the club. Their weekly meetings were more than social gatherings, for they carried through so many local plans that at one time there was danger that one club would arrogate to itself and exercise the authority of a synod of elders. Country Churches, seeking pecuniary aid, must first appeal to this club for its sanction. It gave advice concerning the establishment of new Churches and the relations of pastors to their flocks, settled Church difficulties, kept close watch over the lives and opinions of its own members, and exclusions were frequent for

heresy and ill-conduct. The London Baptist Board is the lineal descendant and survivor of one of these clubs, though the character of its meetings and the nature of its functions are so changed as scarcely to be recognizable.

The Six-Principle Baptists established a General Assembly in March, 1690, but part of them dissented from all the Confessions of their brethren, as savoring of human creeds. Some of them were Calvinistic and some Arminian, but all accepted and laid special stress upon the six principles enumerated in Heb. 6:1,2; namely, Repentance, faith, baptism, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life. John Griffeth was their principal writer, and many of the Welsh Churches practiced the laying on of hands in receiving members. At their best estate they numbered but eleven 'Churches in England, which gradually united with the other Baptists, and vanished as a distinct people. A few of them, however, are still found in Rhode Island.

Abraham Booth wielded great influence amongst the Baptists at this time. He was born in Derbyshire, 1734, and at twenty-one united with the General Baptists, and soon became pastor of a Church at Kirby-Woodhouse. His doctrinal views were stoutly Arminian, and he wrote a 'Poem on Absolute Predestination,' in which he handled the doctrines of Calvinism with such great severity as to excite doubt in his own mind; so that, on a fuller investigation, he 'renounced' his poem as 'detestable' in his own sight. He wrote his most able work on 'The Reign of Grace,' and submitted it to the saintly Venn, who not only persuaded him to publish it, but took enough copies of it himself to pay for the printing. It passed through many editions, and made its author famous. He left the General Baptists about 1765, and became pastor of the Little Prescott Street, Particular Baptist Church, London, where he remained for thirty-seven years. Here he was very active and

useful, being the author of eight distinct works, amongst them his 'Pedobaptism Examined,' which is characterized by great research, and has never been fairly answered. He had much to do with founding Stepney College; and for his candor, purity and consecration to Christ became one of the brightest lights in London. He died in 1806, in his seventy-third year.

A few words about THE IRISH BAPTISTS may properly close this chapter. We have already seen that, in the introduction of Christianity, Ireland abounded in those large baptismal occasions wherein many thousands were baptized in a day. For hundreds of years this practice was continued, as Irish ecclesiastical history shows, and as is attested by the ruins of several elaborate baptisteries still extant, amongst which is that of Mellifont, given below.

In the early Middle Ages the Irish Christians were amongst the first scholars in Europe, but the Danish and English conquests reduced that fair land to gross ignorance. It was then, as now, largely Catholic, but Protestantism grew under Henry and Edward, his son. Mary attempted to frustrate it by persecution but Elizabeth protected it, and under James I the province of Ulster was filled with colonists from Scotland, who laid the foundations of Irish Presbyterianism. Under the treachery of Charles I, who hoped for the support of Catholics, the vile insurrection of Catholics and massacre of Protestants took place in 1641. As the strength of Cromwell's army consisted of Baptists and Independents; when he overran Ireland, 1649, Baptists abounded in his forces, and they organized Churches as opportunity served. It is reported by Thomas Harrison, in writing to Thurloe, 1655, that there were twelve governors of towns and cities who were Baptists, with ten colonels, three or four lieutenant-colonels, ten majors, nineteen or twenty captains, and

twenty-three officers, on the civil list. Fleetwood, the governor, Colonel Jones and a majority of the Council which governed Ireland, are said to have been Baptists. Both the Independents and the Presbyterians complained of their preponderance in official places, and Richard Baxter bluntly said, 'In Ireland the Anabaptists are grown so high that many of the soldiers were rebaptized as the way to preferment.'

Probably the first Irish Baptist Church since the Reformation was formed in Dublin by Thomas Patience, assistant pastor to Kiffin in London. The date is not clear, but in 1653 a Church was found there, with others in Waterford, Clonmel, Kilkenny, Cork, Limerick, Wexford, Carrickfergus and Kerry. It is most likely that these were largely English, and their republican principles were so staunch that they opposed Cromwell's Lord Protectorate, and he sent over his son, Henry, to watch and influence them. After the Restoration, 1660, their feeble Churches began to decline, though a few of them continued; and after a hard struggle, we have but 23 Churches and 1,639 communicants in Ireland at this day. They deserved to decline, for, as they came in with the conquering army, they so far forgot their principles as to accept State pay with the Independents and Presbyterians. Their course was severely condemned by the Welsh and English Baptists as a sacrifice of their principles, but in 1660, by a special inquiry, they were deprived of this State support, to the gratitude of their British brethren.

The most illustrious of the Irish Baptists is Dr. ALEXANDER CARSON. Born in the north of Ireland in 1776, he became, perhaps, the first scholar in the University of Glasgow, and settled, as a Presbyterian pastor, at Tubbermore, 1798, where he received £100 per year from the government. He was a Greek scholar of the first order, and might have become Professor of

Baptists of Great Britain

Greek in the University of Glasgow on signing the 'Standards' of the Church of Scotland. But he gradually adopted Baptist views, gave up his living, and gathered a little band of Baptists about him in a Church without a meeting-house, and, with himself, enduring deep poverty. In his day he was probably the leading scholar in the Baptist ranks in Britain, and was a voluminous writer and profound reasoner. His

work on Baptism has no superior and few equals. Some have called him the 'Jonathan Edwards of Ireland,' and with reason; for it is doubtful whether Ireland has produced his equal since the death of Archbishop Usher. He died in 1844, after nearly half a century spent in the ministry; but his name is fragrant wherever his works are known.

Chapter 10 - The Scotch and English Baptists – Missions – Men of Note

There are distinct pre-Reformation traces of Baptist principles and practices in Scotland. Councils were held at Perth in the years 1242 and 1296, the canons of which require that in baptism, 'Before the immersion the aforesaid words should be pronounced.' In Holyrood Chapel was a brazen font in which the children of the Scotch monarchs were 'dipped,' which was removed by the English in 1544, and destroyed in the time of Cromwell. The *Edinburgh Encyclopaedia* states, that sprinkling was never practiced in Scotland in ordinary cases till 1559, when it was introduced from Geneva. Many of Cromwell's army, which went to Scotland in 1650 under command of Monk, were Baptists, who kept up religious worship in their camps and immersed the converted soldiers. When Monk left the army, in the beginning of 1653, to command the fleet against the Dutch, he left Major-General Robert Lilburn in command of the troops in Scotland. Monk had been opposed to the Baptists, but Lilburn, being a stout Baptist himself, afforded his soldiery every facility for the spread of their principles. He was anxious to employ Baptist chaplains, for he said that there 'were divers honest Scotch people that longed to be gathered into the same gospel order with themselves.' When some of the troops were garrisoned at Leith and Edinburgh, they formed Baptist Churches; and we are told that many persons were immersed in the water of Leith, which passes Edinburgh on the north and falls into the Frith of Forth at the town of Leith. Amongst these was Lady Wallace of Craigie. Troops were stationed also at Cupar in Fife, where a Mr. Brown preached, and immersed several persons in the river Eden. In 1653 the fourth edition of the Confession of Faith, framed by the London Churches, was published in Edinburgh. It was accompanied by a Preface, signed by Thomas Spencer, Abraham Holmes,

Thomas Powell and John Brady, by appointment of the Churches in Leith and Edinburgh. The army remained in Scotland from 1650 to 1659, but Lilburn was in command only about a year, when Monk resumed command.

Baptist principles spread so rapidly in Scotland, that Presbyterians became alarmed, and at a meeting held in Edinburgh, October 1651, some of the elders expressed the opinion that children should not receive baptism until they made confession of faith. Some ministers also were complained of, as Alexander Cornnell, of Linlithgow, and Thomas Charteris, of Stenhouse, because they 'baptized old people, maintained Anabaptism and would not baptize infants.' Whitlock writes, that, in 1652, Parliament issued a declaration against the Scotch Dippers; and in 1653, George Fox complains of the firm resistance which he met from the Baptists of Carlisle, Leith and 'Edenbro,' but claims a great victory over them. John Knox, afraid of 'their poison,' plied his powerful pen to write them down. They were also bitterly persecuted, for on January 24th, 1654, they presented to Monk, the 'commander-in-chief of all the forces in Scotland, the humble address of the baptized Churches, consisting of officers, soldiers *and others*, walking together in gospel order, at St. Johnston's, Leith and Edinburgh, for toleration or freedom quietly to worship God; which freedom we conceive is a fruit of the purchase of our dear Redeemer.' But when Heath reached Leith, 1659, he shut up Colonel Holmes and all the other Baptist officers there, first in Timplallan Castle, and then on Basse Island. The fact, that Baptists had become so numerous, both in the army and navy, and were taking such high ground against the assumptions of Cromwell excited the fear of the rulers that they would rise, seize the

government and proclaim freedom of conscience for all. Guizot writes: 'The king's interest is also supported by the Presbyterians, although they are republicans in principle; and it is only the fear that the Anabaptists and other sectaries may obtain the government, which leads them to oppose the present authorities.'

Baptist opposition to Cromwell's aggressions cost him much trouble, and, broad as he was, he began to persecute them, as is clearly shown in a letter sent to him and preserved by Thurloe, his secretary, which puts some very troublesome questions to him. After saying that Baptists had 'filled' his 'towns, cities, provinces, castles, navies, tents and armies,' the writer asks him whether, '1. You had come to that height you are now in if the Anabaptists had been as much your enemies as they were your friends? 2. Whether the Anabaptists were ever unfaithful either to the Commonwealth, etc., in general, or to your highness in particular? 3. Whether Anabaptists are not to be commended for their integrity, which had rather kept good faith and a good conscience, although it may lose them their employment, than to keep their employment with the loss of both?' Then the writer asks: 'Whether one hundred of the old Anabaptists, such as marched under your command in 1648, 1649, and 1650, etc., be not as good as two hundred of your new courtiers, if you were in such a condition as you were at Dunbar?' This last allusion is to the battle which Cromwell won near Edinburgh, with ten thousand troops, many of whom were Baptists, over thirty thousand Scotch soldiers. All record of Baptists, however, in Scotland, is lost, from 1660 to something beyond 1700. Sir William Sinclair, of Keiss, Caithness, was immersed in England, and returned to Scotland to preach there; he immersed his candidates, and formed a Baptist Church upon his own estate, but suffered much. The Baptist Church at Keiss

was formed about 1750, and is now the oldest in Scotland.

The next, in point of age, is the Bristo Place Church, Edinburgh, which came into existence on this wise: Rev. Robert Carmichael, who had been pastor of a Glassite Church in Glasgow, and of a Scots Independent Church in Edinburgh, came to reject infant baptism, and went to London, where he was immersed by Dr. Gill, October 9th, 1765. On returning to Edinburgh, he baptized five members of his former Church, and formed a Baptist Church, which met in St. Cecilia's Hall, Niddry Street. Archibald McLean, had been a member of Carmichael's Church in Glasgow, and came to Edinburgh, where he was also baptized. He organized what is now the John Street Baptist Church in Glasgow, baptizing its first members in the Clyde, near Glasgow Green. In about a year, McLean became colleague to Carmichael, who removed to Dundee in 1769, when McLean was left as pastor proper, with Dr. Robert Walker, a well-known surgeon, as joint elder. McLean was born at East Kilbride, 1733, but early in life resided in the Island of Mull, where he acquired the Gaelic language. At school he became a fair Latin scholar, and afterward studied Greek and Hebrew. When young, he heard Whitefield preach and was largely influenced thereby. In 1746, he became a successful printer at Glasgow, where he remained till 1767, when he removed to Edinburgh. While pastor in Edinburgh he wrote much; as, a work on Christ's Commission, a 'Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,' and a 'Review of Wardlaw's Abrahamic Covenant.' His works were collected and published in seven volumes, 1805; he died December 21st, 1812, at the age of about eighty, his life having been wonderfully blessed of God. Although not the first Scotch Baptist in point of time, yet his labors and writings exerted so much influence, that in this respect

he may be called their founder.

ROBERT HALDANE was born in London, 1764, being a babe there when Gill baptized Carmichael. He studied at the High School and University of Edinburgh and removed to Airthrey in 1786, where he inherited a large estate. He became a great writer and philanthropist, giving \$350,000 for charitable purposes within fifteen years, and during his life educating three hundred ministers of the Gospel at an expense of \$100,000. Amongst these was Dr. Bogue, of Gosport, and Mr. Ewing, of Edinburgh. At Geneva he lectured to the students on the Epistle to the Romans, who, with D'Aubigne, Malan, and Gaussen, were delighted listeners. He published his 'Exposition of Romans,' also his 'Evidence and Authority of Revelation,' and his work on 'The Inspiration of Scripture.' He died in Edinburgh in 1842.

JAMES ALEXANDER HALDANE, his brother, was born at Dundee, 1768. He entered the navy, as Robert had also. But early in life he became a devout Christian, and traveled all through Scotland and the Orkney Islands, preaching to great multitudes. In 1799 he was ordained pastor of an Independent congregation in Edinburgh, where he labored for nearly fifty years, with great success. His brother, Robert, built for him a large Tabernacle in 1801, and in 1808 the brothers became Baptists. Wilson gives an interesting account of their conversion. After speaking of their 'zeal in behalf of primitive Christianity,' and of the erection by them of many 'meeting-houses of large dimensions,' he relates that several persons from Scotland, in connection with them, settled in London, 1806, and formed a Church in Cateaton Street. William Ballantine, formerly of the University of Edinburgh, a man of good classical and theological attainments, was their leader. He says that 'the Messrs. Haldane, and the societies in their connection, were hitherto Pedit-baptist.' 'But after about two

years...several persons, suspecting that they were in an error upon this point, began to study the controversy, were convinced of their mistake, and received baptism by immersion. This put the Messrs. Haldane themselves upon an examination of the subject, and the result was that they also became convinced, and were baptized, though at some interval from each other. The report of these changes reaching London, Mr. Ballantine was necessarily put upon a more careful examination of the subject, and the result was that he also renounced his former sentiments, and was baptized by immersion. But this occasioned a convulsion in the society. Mr. Ballantine relinquished his station and joined the Scotch Baptists in Redcross Street. Most of the members of this Church gradually renounced their former notions, and, we believe, they are now (1808) entirely Baptists. But they allow of mixed communion, and in this respect differ from all the other Particular Baptist Churches of London.'

During the first half of the present century REV. CHRISTOPHER ANDERSON was the foremost man among the Baptists of Scotland. He was a native of Edinburgh, born in 1782. He was converted in 1799, under the ministry of the Rev. James Haldane, when he was still a Congregationalist. Intercourse with English Baptist students at the University reawakened his interest in the subject of baptism. He had previously held that believers only should be baptized, but, not agreeing with the Scotch Baptists in their views of the ministry and church government, had not regarded the matter as a personal duty. He was immersed by one of the English students, and was promptly excluded from Mr. Haldane's Church. A few years after this Mr. Haldane himself, and his distinguished brother, Robert, committed the same offense and became Baptists. A visit of Andrew Fuller to Edinburgh awakened a desire

Chapter 10 - The Scotch and English Baptists – Missions – Men of Note

in young Anderson to give himself to the work of the ministry amongst the heathen, and Mr. Fuller encouraged him. He entered the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently continued his studies with Rev. John Sutcliff, of Olney, one of the founders of the Baptist Missionary Society, and the originator of the Monthly Concert of Prayer for Missions. Much to the disappointment of Mr. Anderson, he found that his feeble health would not permit him to live in India. His great ability as a preacher had been already recognized, and he declined numerous calls from London and other cities, that he might found a regular Baptist Church in his native city. He began his work in 1806, and in a few years his Church had erected a spacious house of worship, which was thronged with worshipers for more than thirty years, the doors being generally besieged long before the hour of opening. Rev. Dr. Cheever, who visited Scotland in 1840, gave some vivid sketches of his character and discourses in letters to the *New York Observer*, which he concluded by saying: 'Mr. Anderson is one of the most interesting expository preachers I ever heard. His sermons are most simple, affectionate, conversational, but rich with thought and Christian feeling, and dropped from the lips of the preacher like the droppings of a full honey-comb.'

Mr. Anderson was the intimate and confidential friend of Andrew Fuller, and the chief helper in Scotland to the support of Carey, Marshman and Ward in India. After Fuller's death, and the unfortunate disagreement between the Serampore brethren and the Missionary Society, he succeeded Fuller, serving gratuitously as secretary of the Serampore Mission until the reunion, a period of twenty years. He was the leader in the Home Mission work in the north of Scotland and in Ireland, especially in the work of giving the Bible in the original native dialect. Abundant as

were his pulpit and other labors; he was a diligent student and an author of great distinction. His work on 'The Domestic Constitution; or, The Family Circle the Source of rational Stability,' had a wide circulation in Europe, and several editions of it have appeared in America. But the crowning work of his life was 'The Annals of the English Bible.' It cost him fourteen years of toil, involving repeated journeys to the Continent, and to the homes of Tyndale and Coverdale in England, in order that the work might be trustworthy in the utmost degree. The story of the suffering fathers, who sought to give the people the word of God in their mother-tongue, is simply and eloquently told, and the work is a monument of erudition. Mr. Anderson was one of the most popular of Scottish preachers, ranking with Wardlaw, Chalmers, Guthrie and Candlish, until his voice became impaired by sickness. His Church was called an English Baptist Church, to distinguish it from those Churches which had a plurality of elders. It was composed entirely of believers immersed upon confession of Christ, and practiced restricted communion. Mr. Anderson died in 1852. His funeral sermon was preached by his friend for more than fifty years, Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow. Dr. Cheever says of him: 'Mr. Anderson's conversation in private was in the same interesting familiar, rich and instructive style as his preaching in public. Altogether he was one of the most heavenly minded and delightful men with whom I became acquainted in Great Britain.'

The Baptists have never been numerous in Scotland, but at this time they number 96 churches, 10,905 communicants and 86 pastors. They flourish chiefly in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Montrose and Dundee. They are decidedly Calvinistic, are marked for the purity of their lives and their great missionary zeal. Their Church organizations are purely

Baptists of Great Britain

Congregational, with a plurality of elders in each Church. They observe the Supper weekly, but have been somewhat divided as to whether it should be administered when a minister is not present. In discipline they are very strict, use great plainness of apparel, and aim honestly in all things to keep the apostolic injunction to the letter: 'Stand fast in the faith.' In view of their warm discussions and many divisions on minor subjects, the question will fairly arise in inquiring minds, whether or not they understand as well the secret of keeping 'the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.' Past divisions have been the fruitful source of their present weakness, but generally they have now adopted a wiser course in this respect, and their prospects are much more inviting for the future. Their ministry has been marked by many men of rare ability, notably amongst them the late Dr. James Paterson, for forty-six years pastor of the Hope Street Church, in Glasgow; Dr. Landels, late of London, now of Edinburgh; and Dr. Culross, President of the Baptist College, Bristol, England.

ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D., the present pastor of the Union Chapel, Manchester, is probably the most powerful pulpit orator that the Baptists of Scotland have ever produced. He was born in Glasgow in 1825, where his father was long the pastor of a Baptist Church. At fifteen Alexander was baptized by Dr. Paterson, and when little more than sixteen he entered Stepney as a student for the ministry. So thorough was his course that at its close he took his bachelor's degree at the London University with the prize for proficiency in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. He is a great and original thinker, who bows in the utmost veneration before the inspired word, and breathes its atmosphere. His imagination kindles much after the order of the Hebrew prophets; he holds his subject with the ease and grip of a giant; his voice is flexible

and full of sympathy; his gesticulation is abundant and impressive, though often ungraceful; and his love for Christ melts his whole soul. He is nervous, abstracted, self-sacrificing, a model of rich, ornate transparency; and many who are pulpit masters themselves rank him without hesitation as the first preacher in Great Britain after the intellectual order. He has filled but two pastorates, that of Portland Place, Southampton, and his present charge in Manchester. The honorary degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by the University of Edinburgh, 1878, and lately he declined the Hebrew lectureship at Regent's Park College.

Our Scotch brethren are not wanting in distinguished laymen who honor their Churches. THOMAS SPENCER BAYNES, LL.D., stands notably amongst them. He is Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrew's, and the son of a noted Baptist minister of Somersetshire, England. He was born in 1823, converted early in life, and became a student in Bristol College with a view to entering the ministry, obtaining the Ward Scholarship in the Edinburgh University. This is a prize of £100 per annum for three years for Baptist students. It has proved of great service, Dr. Angus, Rev. C.M. Birrell and others having obtained this honor. He was connected in Edinburgh with Christopher Anderson's Church, and frequently supplied the pulpit while his pastor was preparing his 'Annals of the English Bible.' When in the University his extraordinary, not to say phenomenal, ability and scholarship attracted the attention of the faculty, especially of Professor John Wilson, otherwise known as 'Christopher North,' and Sir William Hamilton. He was elected assistant to Sir William Hamilton, serving with popularity and distinction from 1849 to 1855. During this time he filled many Baptist pulpits as occasional and

stated supply, and was a most attractive preacher. In the year 1851 he translated the 'Port Royal Logic,' adding copious notes. This work was republished in America by Lamport & Co. In 1852 he published an 'Essay on the New Analytic of Logical Forms, with Notes and Historical Appendix.' This is an exposition of the system of Sir William Hamilton. In 1857 he was appointed assistant editor of the London *Daily News*, in which position he remained for seven years. His articles on the American Civil War attracted great admiration. During this time he was also Examiner in Logic and Mental Philosophy in the University of London, and was constantly engaged in delivering lectures on his favorite studies before colleges and other public institutions.

In 1864 he was elected to his present position in the University of St. Andrew's. He is a constant contributor to the *Edinburgh Review*, *Eraser's Magazine* and the *Saturday Review*, and has been for ten years past the editor of the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, now in process of publication. His honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred by the University of Edinburgh.

The ENGLISH BAPTISTS were greatly reduced in numbers by certain undermining influences in the early part of the eighteenth century, but since then the current has greatly changed, and they are now stimulated with new life. Andrew Fuller's 'Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation' has had much to do in awakening this zeal. This treatise was aimed directly against that hyper-Calvinism which denies all duty to God in the unregenerate, and refuses to call them to repentance and Christ. Fuller's book kept him in warm controversy for twenty years, but moderate Calvinism triumphed completely, and was followed by an awakening of the missionary spirit; chiefly under the labors of William Carey and Andrew Fuller. The first Baptist movement in foreign missions was

made at a meeting of the Northampton Association in 1784.

WILLIAM CAREY was born August 17th, 1761, at Paulersbury. His father was a weaver (a descendant of James Carey, curate of that parish from 1624 to 1630), also parish clerk and village schoolmaster, so that William had a fair common-school education. At fourteen he was bound an apprentice to a shoemaker, but his thirst for knowledge was so quenchless that he habitually worked with a book before him. Finding many Greek words which he could not understand, in a Commentary, he sought help of Tom Jones, a weaver, who had abused a classical education. He became familiar with the works of Jeremy Taylor and such other authors as he could command; and Thomas Scott, the commentator, predicted that this 'plodder' would prove no ordinary man. William Manning, a Dissenter, his shopmate, led him to Christ, and at twenty-two he was immersed in the river New, near Dr. Doddridge's chapel, Northampton, by John Ryland, Jr. The baptism of a poor journeyman shoemaker excited little interest, but Ryland chanced on a prophetic text that day: 'The last shall be first.' Carey's chief desire, after his conversion, was to qualify himself for usefulness, and his remarkable gift for acquiring languages soon made him master of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German and French. He began to keep school, but could not govern; he said, 'The boys kept me,' and so he did not succeed well. Soon he removed to Moulton, and, under the advice of Mr. Sutcliff, applied to the Church at Olney for admission to the ministry. That high and mighty body condescended to take him into its membership, and, on hearing him preach, 'Resolved' that he be 'allowed' to preach elsewhere in small places, and that 'he should engage again on suitable occasions for some time before us, in order that further trial be made of his

ministerial gifts.'

A year after this, June 16th, 1785, 'the case of Brother Carey was considered, and unanimous satisfaction with his ministerial abilities being expressed, a vote was passed to call him to the ministry *at a proper time*.' 'Call,' as here used, would mean license with us, and as the brother rather grew upon them, they licensed him to preach August 10th 'wherever the providence of God might open his way.' That way was opened first at Moulton, where he became pastor, working at his trade to prevent starvation, the Church being able 'to raise enough to pay for the clothes worn-out in their service.' While teaching school, he reveled in Cook's 'Voyages Around the World,' and closely studied geography. He made a globe of leather, and traced the outlines of the earth upon it for his classes. Then the thought flashed upon him that four hundred millions of people had never heard of Christ, and that moment, surrounded by a handful of Northamptonshire urchins, with his eye on that russet globe, the great Baptist missionary enterprise was born. As is generally the case with Churches who pay their ministers next to nothing, certain cantankerous members made him much trouble. The records of the Church say that one sister 'neglected coming to hear,' and was excluded. Old Madame Britain was charged with 'excessive passion, tattling and tale-bearing, by which the peace of the Church was much broken.' They 'suspended and admonished her' to keep the unruly member under better subjection, and seem at last to have saved her, tongue and all. John and Ann Law kept the 'Workhouse,' and were charged with 'cruelty to the poor,' a charge found 'too true.' They were advised to resign their office, and were 'suspended till they do so.'

Carey removed to Leicester, where he served as pastor and predecessor to Robert Hall. There he determined to do something for the

heathen and wrote on the subject. His 'Inquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use means for the Conversion of the Heathen' was published in 1792, but found few readers and produced little effect. To most of the Baptists his views were visionary and even wild, in open conflict with God's sovereignty. At a meeting of ministers, where the senior Ryland presided, Carey proposed that at the next meeting they discuss the duty of attempting to spread the Gospel amongst the heathen. Fuller was present, but the audacity of the proposition made him hold his breath, while Ryland, shocked, sprang to his feet and ordered Carey to sit down, saying: 'When God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid or mine!' Nothing daunted, Carey continued to preach in Harvey Lane, Leicester, to teach school, work on the bench, and pursue his studies. He gave Monday to languages, Tuesday to science and history, Wednesday to lecturing, Thursday to visiting, Friday and Saturday to preparation for the pulpit, and on Sunday he preached three times. At this period Dr. Arnold gave him the use of his superior library. What Ryland called the 'Antinomian Devil' made such havoc of his Church, however, that he was obliged to dissolve it and form a new one of better materials. Soon he was cheered on finding that Fuller, Sutcliff, Pearce and young Ryland held his views on foreign missions, although Stennett and Booth stood aloof. At the October meeting of ministers, 1791, Sutcliff preached on being 'Very jealous for the Lord of Hosts,' and Fuller on the 'Pernicious Influences of Delay,' when the meeting resolved that 'something should be done.'

The Association met at Nottingham, May 31st, 1792, when Carey preached his great sermon from Isa. 54:2,3; representing the Church as a poor widow living in a cottage by herself. The voice, 'Thy Maker is thy Husband,'

told her to look for an increase of family; therefore, she must enlarge her tent, and 'expect great things from God, and attempt great things for God.' This appeal settled the question. The Churches were seized with a sense of criminal neglect; but even then they were about to adjourn without doing any thing but weep, when Carey seizing Fuller's hand, demanded that the first step be taken on the spot. His heart was breaking, and his sobs compelled the assembly to stop. It was resolved, 'That a plan be prepared against the next ministers' meeting at Kettering, for the establishment of a society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen.' Such a meeting was held October 2d, 1792, and at its close twelve men met in the parlor of Mrs. Wallis, a widow, and formed the first Baptist Missionary Society. Andrew Fuller was made Secretary, Reynold Hogg, Treasurer; with Ryland, Sutcliff, Carey and afterward Pearce, as the Committee of management. They then made a subscription out of their penury of £13 2s. 6d. Pearce preached on the subject at home, and soon sent 'the surprising sum of £70 to the Society.'

In April, 1793, Carey and Thomas started for India, despite the opposition of the East India Company, the indifference of their own brethren, and the disdain of the public; and did such missionary work there as has not been known since the Apostolic Age.

For years, however, it was doubtful whether the mission would not result in disastrous failure. The Anglo-Indian government would not allow it to be established in their territory, and the missionaries found shelter in Serampore, under the Danish governor. Here Carey printed the New Testament in Bengali, the first translation into a heathen tongue in modern times. Dr. Thomas, Carey's fellow-laborer, had given surgical attention to Krishna Pal, and in December, 1800, Dr. Carey immersed this native, together with his own

son, Felix, in the Ganges, in the presence of a great multitude; soon after a second son was baptized. This faithful Hindu is the only converted heathen who has added an inspiring hymn to the songs of Christendom. He wrote the lines beginning with:

'O thou, my soul, forget no more.'

In his conversion we have the first-fruits of the great Indian harvest which has followed. Since then, Christianity has wrought wonders in India, in the abolition of superstitious rites, the decline of caste and the elevation of morals.

Carey did not long engage in the active work of an evangelist. His support was light, he must master the Eastern languages, and for a time he earned his daily bread in an indigo factory. But when the Marquis of Wellesley founded a college at Fort William, in 1801, he found no man in India so fitted to fill the chair of Oriental languages as this despised missionary, who had been driven for refuge under an alien flag. He offered the post to Carey, it was accepted, and he became the leader of his age in Oriental literature and philosophy. He prepared grammars and lexicons in the Mahrata, Sanskrit, Punjabi, Telagu, Bengali and Bhotanta dialects. Wellesley pronounced his Sanskrit Grammar 'the source and root of the principal dialects throughout India.' He translated no fewer than twenty-four different versions of the Scriptures, with little aid from others, into the tongues spoken by one third of our race. This was practically new work, the execution of which has enabled the Max Mullers of our day to add completeness to first attempts, by ripe scholarship. A child learns now what only the intellect of a Kepler and a Newton discovered. Well did Wilberforce say of Carey: 'A sublimer thought cannot be conceived than when a poor cobbler formed the resolution to give to the

millions of Hindus the Bible in their own language.'

While Carey was quietly doing his work in India. Great Britain was kept in a ferment by war on the mission, which drew many of its ablest pens into the conflict, not only in the Reviews, but by the pamphlet and newspaper press. The *Edinburgh Review* constantly ridiculed the mission, denouncing the missionaries as 'fools,' 'madmen,' 'tinkers' and 'cobblers;' and many public men sided with that periodical. But the 'Quarterly' came to their defense, through noble men not Baptists, not the least amongst them being Dr. Adam Clark. In addition to much that the 'Quarterly' said was this: 'Only fourteen years have elapsed since Thomas and Carey set foot in India, and in that time have these missionaries acquired this gift of tongues. In fourteen years these "low-born and low-bred mechanics" have done more toward spreading the knowledge of the Scriptures among the heathen than has been accomplished, or even attempted, by all the world besides.' Carey had constant struggles to maintain his health, but he had great consolation in his family, for his three sons were all converted and consecrated to the missionary work by baptism and the laying on of his own hands.' But he was oppressed by sad trouble in England, in what is now known as the 'Serampore Controversy.' While in the employ of the British government he had received about £80,000, all of which he had devoted, beyond a bare subsistence, to the establishment of churches, schools and the support of his fellow missionaries. This was no shield, however, against the most fiery and shameful attacks of some of his own brethren in England upon him and his work. In 1825 they rabidly accused the 'Serampore College' of possessing immense wealth, of extravagant living and the assumption of unwarranted power. For a time, excitement and abuse ran

wild, and men in high position condescended to disgrace themselves in these unfounded assaults. The result was that the College stood aloof from the Society from 1827 to 1837, during which time Carey fell asleep in Jesus; for he died June 9th, 1834, the greatest missionary since the Apostle Paul. His dust reposes in the mission grounds which his own toil had secured for Christ, and his missionary work never stood more firmly than today.

Carey's two colleagues were to him what Luke and Barnabas were to Paul. JOSHUA MARSHMAN received a common village education in Wiltshire, and was bred a weaver. By devotion to hard study he so improved his education that in 1794 he took charge of a school for the Broadmead Baptist Church at Bristol. Shortly afterward he was converted and baptized into that Church, and determined to become a missionary. He sailed for India in 1799, where he studied the Bengali and Sanskrit with such energy that his Oriental attainments were second only to those of Carey. For fifteen years he toiled over the first translation of the Bible into Chinese, and published it at the Serampore press. He also published a Chinese grammar and a translation of Confucius, and was joint editor with Carey of his Sanskrit grammar and Bengali dictionary. He was a lovely spirit, and was drawn to that other Israelite in whom was no guile, Henry Martyn; they often walked arm and arm together on the banks of the Hooghly, like brothers, longing to bless all about them. In 1811 Brown University conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and in 1837 he followed Carey to his rest.

WILLIAM WARD was Carey's second colleague. He was born at Derby, in 1769, and became a printer. While still a young man he rose to be editor of the *Daily Mercury*, and subsequently of other papers in Stafford and Hull. At the latter place he was baptized, and

soon began to study for the ministry; but when the Missionary Society needed a printer, he went to Serampore, took a press with him, and printed Carey's Bengali New Testament. He was a scholar of no mean attainments, and his book on the life of the Hindus, published in 1811, was long the standard work on that subject. In 1819 he visited England and the United States, and returned to his field in 1821, carrying with him \$10,000 which he had collected for the education of the native ministry in the Serampore College. Soon his health broke, and he died in 1823.

ANDREW FULLER was; however, the most important coadjutor of Carey. They had an understanding from the first, that while Carey 'went down into the well, Fuller should hold the rope;' and he held it firmly with a giant's grip, for he remained the secretary of the Society to the day of his death. Fuller was born in 1754; and while witnessing a baptism in 1770, was so deeply moved that he became a Christian, being baptized at Soham into the Church of which he became pastor in 1775. He removed to Kettering in 1782, and became an eloquent, original and successful preacher, while in theology he was one of the lights and leaders of the world. He loved to see the Churches shake off the shackles of hyper-Calvinism, for he said, in his strong language, that 'had matters gone on but a few years the Baptists would have become a perfect dunghill in society.' In 1785 he published his great essay on the 'Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation,' which divided the stagnant waters, as would a blow from the rod of Moses. Immediately he was attacked on every side, and he followed in vigorous defense, as a profound thinker and a ready debater. His 'Calvinistic and Socinian Systems Examined and Compared,' and the 'Gospel its own Witness,' did much to bring about a reform, although the contest was severe indeed. His extraordinary power in controversy

and exposition presented the truth in a new light. The most complicated questions opened themselves to his massive understanding, and not only seeing them clearly himself, he possessed the power to make others see them. He had an unbiased judgment, an unconquerable resolution, a regal conscience, and a heart as tender as love could make any heart. Withal, he had a powerful body, great courage and rare sagacity. He put a new phase upon Calvinism, which has not only molded his own denomination, but has spread its leaven through all other Calvinistic bodies. Princeton and Yale both honored him with the doctorate, which, however he, declined.

Carey appears to have first seen Fuller at an associational meeting at Olney, June, 1782, where he heard 'a round-headed, rustic-looking' young minister preach 'On being men in Understanding,' and heard him read a circular letter on 'The grace of Hope.' Carey had fasted all that day, 'because he had not a penny to buy his dinner,' but, though hungry, he seems to have relished Fuller's words mightily.

Their intimacy began at a ministers' meeting in Northampton when Carey was unexpectedly called to preach. As he left the pulpit Fuller grasped his hand, and the two men, in understanding and in hope, became one for life. We have also an account of a visit which Fuller made to Carey's workshop, where he saw a rude map of several sheets of paper pasted together, on which the lines of the nations were traced, hung upon the wall. This Carey studied while he plied the hammer, the lap-stone and the awl. After they had entered the mission work together, Fuller traversed Great Britain again and again as the champion of missions, and did more to keep the Churches alive to the subject than any half-dozen men in his times. For more than twenty years his holy integrity guided the Society through all its straits, including a fierce struggle with

Baptists of Great Britain

Parliament to keep India open to the Gospel, the chief bond that has held it to the scepter of its 'empress' to this day. Before he died (1815) he saw over seven hundred natives baptized, ten thousand heathen children educated in the schools, and translations of the Bible proceeding in twenty-seven languages, and he wrote to Carey: 'The spark which God stirred you up to strike has kindled a great fire!' The late Dr. W.B. Williams expresses his conception of Fuller's might by denominating him a 'Shamgar,' 'entering the battlefield with but an ox-goad, against the mailed errorists of his island.'... 'The man who encountered him in argument generally bore the marks of a bludgeon from the encounter.' Pendergast, a member of Parliament, and a great duelist, demanded of Wilberforce who this Fuller was. He seemed to have stirred that body to its center in behalf of Indian missions, and this member would challenge him to a duel. 'Wilberforce smilingly assured him that he knew Fuller, but that he was not a man who would be moved to such a conference.' His missionary correspondence was extraordinary for its amount and character, and Legh Richmond said of his public papers that they seemed to him 'like specimens from the midst of heaven by the angel in his flight, with the Gospel in his hand.' He pleaded for missions as long as he could hold a pen, having written twelve hours a day as a common thing. On May 7th, 1815, he declared his work ended, and entered into the presence of his Lord at the age of sixty-one.

The establishment of missions in India involved the translation of the Scriptures in the native tongues, and naturally this suggested the need of a society for Bible circulation. In 1804, the British and Foreign Bible Society was formed; Joseph Hughes, a Baptist minister, bore a prominent part in that work. He was appointed one of its secretaries, and became, as

it has been expressed, 'the hands and feet, as he had been the head of the institution.' Its Constitution provided that its 'sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment.' Baptists were large contributors to its treasury, in some cases, being specially urged to co-operate with the Society, instead of sending their money directly to India for the printing of the Scriptures; and the missionaries cordially accepted invitations of co-operation also. In 1809 a grant of £1,000 was made for the printing of Carey's Bengali New Testament. From the beginning Baptist missionaries were faithful to the principle of translating into the heathen languages, every word of the New Testament Greek, for which they could find equivalents. Common honesty required this, to say nothing of responsibility to God, and they made no concealment of their action, but widely avowed it in their official and printed letters. For many years the Bible Society found no fault with this rule of translation, but made numerous grants for the printing of these versions. In them, the Greek word *baptizo* was rendered by a native word which signified to immerse, because it could not in fidelity be translated otherwise. But in 1835 the Pedobaptists in the Society affected a sudden discovery that the word *baptizo* was translated by a word signifying to immerse, and began a hot controversy at once on the subject. They accused the Baptists of obtaining money under false pretenses, and of concealing the true character of the versions which the Society had been openly circulating through India for twenty-six years! By this time the final revision of the Bengali Bible, by Drs. Yates and Pearce, was ready for the press, but the Society refused to make any grant for its circulation, unless the missionaries would either transfer the Greek word, *baptiso*, as it is transferred in the common English version, or render it by some

word that did not mean to immerse. That is to say, they demanded that it should be rendered 'by such terms as may be considered unobjectionable by other denominations composing the Bible Society.' These requirements made the English version the standard by which translations should be made from the Greek, instead of faithfulness to the Greek sense; and it made the wishes of 'denominations' the test of translations, instead of fidelity to the mind of the Holy Spirit who inspired the Bible.

Of course, this left the missionaries no choice of duty to God in the matter as translators. They must either leave the word untranslated, or mistranslate it, against their scholarship and conscience. The latter could not be thought of in any case, and the former would have been cowardly and traitorous to the inspiring Spirit. The translation which they did make was the only one that they could make in the Bengali dialect. It had already been commended by the Home Society, its scholarly accuracy had been approved by the Calcutta Auxiliary Society; and up to this time the Pedobaptist missionaries had followed the same rule of fidelity and used similar words in the Persian and Hindustani versions. The Baptists said, therefore: 'If it is now proposed to set aside the original principles of the Society, and all its former work on the mission field; in order to gratify the denominational feelings of some in the Society, we will not listen to the proposition to sanction sectarian versions. The Greek original is not sectarian, and to give any version a different sense from that original, for the gratification of "denominations," is, to make a translation for sectarian ends, a thing that we cannot consent to do.' Reasonings, memorials and protests were made to the Society, but all to no effect. Accordingly, in order that the translators might do their work faithfully and preserve their honor and self-respect, the Bible

Translation Society was formed, March 24th, 1840. It has been in vigorous operation ever since, having printed and distributed 4,095,000 copies of the Scriptures, at a cost of \$1,000,000. It is gratifying that the best scholarship has ever justified these translations, and at the 79th Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Archbishop Benson took occasion 'to thank the committee very much for having put the word *immerse* in the margin of the translations. I must say that I think they were justified in this step; and I do not doubt that this conciliation, based upon the real root-meaning of the word, will have its effect.' The 'translations' to which the archbishop refers are the Indian versions under the patronage of the above Society.

The General Baptists, who had not co-operated as a body with the Baptist Missionary Society formed in 1792, formed one of their own in 1816, its chief field being Orissa, India, amongst a population of 9,000,000, principally worshipers of Juggernaut. This Society has done a blessed work. It maintains sixteen missionaries, twenty-two native preachers, and has nearly two thousand native converts in its churches.

Activity in foreign missions naturally stimulated the Baptists to home mission work, and an Irish Mission Society was formed in 1814, and in 1816 another for Scotland. Considerable home work has been done through these Societies, but a much larger amount through the Associations. Our English brethren have produced several able historians; as Crosby, Orchard, Mann, Robinson, Evans, Stokes, Jones and Ivimey. Not having room to speak of them all, a word may be said of JOSEPH IVIMEY, by no means the least in the list. He was born in Hampshire in 1773, and became pastor of the Eagle Street Church, London, in 1805. As a defender of the truth he was fearless, and won many souls to Christ,

Baptists of Great Britain

amongst whom was the late Dr. John Bowling, of New York. He baptized both his mother and father, the last at the age of seventy. His 'Life of Milton,' and 'History of the English Baptists' (four volumes), are very valuable works. His name is fragrant in all the English Churches. He died in 1830.

The strongest bond of oneness amongst the Baptists of Great Britain and Ireland has been the Baptist Union. This body was originally formed in 1813, but its present Constitution was adopted in 1882. The following is its declaration of principles:

'In this Union it is fully recognized that every separate Church has liberty to interpret and administer the laws of Christ, and that the immersion of believers is the only Christian baptism.' It is practically a home missionary society, and most of the Churches and Associations are affiliated with it; but its scope of operations includes also an Annuity Fund for ministers, an Augmentation Fund (to increase the income of ill-paid pastors), and an Education Society. The last Report of the Union shows that there are in England, 1,998 churches, 2,817 chapels, 229,311 communicants. Sunday-school scholars, 386,726, and pastors, 1,416.

Ministerial education has been earnestly fostered by our British brethren. During the first century of their history, the greater part of their leading ministers had been educated for the pulpits of the Episcopal Church, and were graduates of Universities. Others, like Gill and Carey, self-taught, were the peers of the best scholars of their times. The necessity for some plan of systematic training of ministers was early felt, and nearly two hundred years ago the academy at Bristol was founded, but in 1770 the Education Society was formed in aid of that academy. Numerous ministers had been trained here before, but then the work took on the character of permanence and a wider scope of study. The institution still exists under the name

of Bristol College. Besides this, Rawdon College was established in Yorkshire in 1804, which still flourishes. In 1810 the famous school at Stepney was established, but in 1856 it was removed, and is now known as the Regent's Park College, London. The Strict Baptists have a promising college at Manchester, which was founded in 1866, and is now under the presidency of Rev. Edward Barker. Besides these, there are the institutions of Haverfordwest, Llan-gollen and Pontypool, the College in Scotland and that founded by Mr. Spurgeon. Without the last named, there are about two hundred and fifty students for the ministry in these various schools. In view of these and many similar facts, Dr. Chalmers felt called upon to say of the English Baptists: 'That they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with authorship of the most exalted piety, as well as the first talent and the first eloquence...That, perhaps, there is not a more intellectual community of ministers in our island, or who have put forth to their number a greater amount of mental power and mental activity in the defense and illustration of our common faith.'

Our English brethren have produced many notable educators, but none more eminent than DR. ANGUS, the principal of Regent's Park College, London. He was born at Bolam in 1816; entered King's College, London; but went to Edinburgh, and in 1837 took his Master's Degree there, after competing successfully for the first prize in mathematics, logic and belles-lettres; besides taking the gold medal in moral and political philosophy. At the close of his course he gained the students' prize, open to the whole University, on the influence of the writings of Lord Bacon. He began to preach early, and before he was twenty-one became pastor of the Church so long presided over by Dr. Gill and Dr. Rippon. In 1838 Dr. Chalmers delivered a course of lectures in 'Defense of

Church Establishments.' A prize of one hundred guineas was offered for an answer. Dr. Angus replied to his renowned tutor in divinity, and the examiners, Drs. Baffles, J. Pye Smith and Mr. William Tooke, unanimously awarded him the prize. For nearly ten years, 1840-49, he was Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society; during which time there was a large increase in its funds. In 1847 he visited the West Indian Stations, to complete the independence of the Churches there. In 1839 he became Principal of the College at Stepney, now Regent's Park, which has become a powerful institution under his management. Within the last twenty years a fund of £12,000 has been raised as a fund for the support of students, besides a sum of £30,000 for supporting professorships of Biblical Literature at the college. A Lectureship has also been founded to bear his name. He is a finished and prolific author. His series of 'Hand-Books on the Bible,' the 'English Tongue,' 'English Literature,' etc., are most valuable productions, being widely known and used, as are his many other works. He was a member for nearly ten years of the London School Board, and for an equal term he was an examiner in the University of London. He also served as one of the late revisers of the New Testament, made for the Convocation of Canterbury. Few men are more accomplished or exert greater influence amongst the *literati* of Great Britain.

JOHN FOSTER, the great essayist, was an honor to the English Baptists. He was born at Halifax in 1770; at seventeen he became a pupil at Bristol College, having been baptized by Dr. Fawcett, and was pastor first at Newcastle. His sanctity and originality in the pulpit were very marked, as his 'Broadmead Discourses' show, yet he was never a preacher of note, being singularly subdued, and peculiarly eccentric in his delivery, and so, seldom preached to more than a handful of people. The late Rev. William

Jay, of Bath, who knew him well, thus speaks of him: 'In preaching, his delivery all through was in a low and equable voice, with a kind of surly tone, and a frequent repetition of a word at the beginning of a sentence. He had a little fierceness occasionally in his eye; otherwise his face was set, and his arms perfectly motionless. He despised all gesticulation, and also all attempts to render any thing emphatical in announcement; looking for the effect in the bare sentiment itself, unhelped by any thing in the delivery, which he professed to despise.' He writes thus of himself to Mr. Horsfall: 'I have involuntarily caught a habit of looking too much on the right side of the meeting. 'Tis on account of about half a dozen sensible fellows who sit together there. I cannot keep myself from looking at them. I sometimes almost forget that I have any other auditors. They have so many significant looks, pay such particular and minute attention, and so instantaneously catch any thing curious, that they become a kind of mirror in which the preacher may see himself. Sometimes, whether you will believe it or not, I say humorous things. Some of these men perceive it and smile. I, observing, am almost betrayed into a smile myself.' He was pastor also in Dublin, Chichester, Dowend and Frome. His wonderful essays on character, romance, taste and popular ignorance, rank him amongst the first literary men of England. His thought is profound, his eloquence massive and his style very lucid. He died October 15th, 1843.

A race of singularly influential laymen have been raised in the British Baptist Churches, amongst whom may be mentioned Wm. B. Gurney, for his great missionary enterprise; Sir Samuel Morton Peto, for his rare piety and benevolence; Sir Robert Lush, late Lord-Justice of the High Court of Appeals, for his simplicity of heart and his professional eminence; and MAJOR-GENERAL HAVELOCK, for his

skillful patriotism and consecration to Christ. His name has become so historic in connection with the late Sepoy Rebellion, that a fuller notice of him is desirable.

This Christian hero was born April 5th, 1795, at Bishop-Wearmouth. His father was wealthy, and his mother was a very devout Christian, who daily gathered her seven children about her for prayer and the study of the Scriptures. He was educated at the Charterhouse, and read law under Chitty, at the Middle Temple. In 1815 he entered the army, and eight years afterward was sent to India. On the sea he consecrated himself to Christ, became a lowly follower of the Lamb, and at once made his Christianity felt upon all around him by preaching the Gospel to his fellow soldiers. He served with great distinction in Burma and Afghanistan from 1824 to 1851, when he became adjutant-general of the queen's troops in India. He had been immersed on his trust in Christ at Serampore in 1830, and had married a daughter of Dr. Marshman, the great missionary there. His custom was to spend two hours alone with God every morning, whether in camp or campaign, and, as often as he could find time, to read and expound the Scriptures to his men. His biographer gives a touching account of an officer hearing hymns floating around a heathen pagoda, and on entering, finding Havelock, with about a hundred soldiers, reading the Scriptures to them by the light of the dim lamps burning before the idols. No wonder that the troops of this splendid Christian soldier were renowned for their prudence and bravery, even to daring, or that their invincibility was ascribed to the fact that they were 'Havelock's Saints.' The general spent 1856-57 in Persia, but immediately, on the breaking out of the Sepoy Rebellion, hastened to the front, and gained many brilliant victories over Nana-Sahib, at Cawnpore, Lucknow and other places, subduing 50,000 drilled troops

with 2,500 men. Parliament created him a major-general and a baronet, and gave him a pension of £1,000 a year. This thoughtful and pure servant of God died in India, November 22d, 1859, saying to Sir James Outram: 'For more than forty years I have so ruled my life that when death came I might face it without fear. I am not in the least afraid; to die is gain. I die happy and contented. 'Then calling his eldest son to his side, he lovingly said to him: 'Come, my son, and see how a Christian can die!'

HUGH STOWELL BROWN stood prominent amongst the most able and useful pastors of England. His father was a clergyman of the English Church, and Hugh was born in the Isle of Man, August 10th, 1823. The following interesting statement is taken from 'Men of the Time;' he was 'nephew of the Rev. Hugh Stowell, of Manchester. He was educated partly at home and partly at the Douglas Grammar School, until he reached the age of fifteen, when he came to England to learn land-surveying. After spending about two years in mastering the drudgery and details of that business, his views underwent a change, and he repaired to Wolverton for the purpose of learning the profession of an engineer. This occupation he followed until he became of age, and he drove a locomotive engine on the London and Northwestern Railway for six months. It was his custom, after his day's work at Wolverton was done, to spend four or five hours in reading and in meditating on what he had read; and his first classical exercises were written with a piece of chalk inside the fire-box of a locomotive engine. Resolving to become a clergyman of the Church of England, he entered as a student at King's College, in his native town of Douglas, and studied there for three years. Doubts, however, came over his mind respecting the truth of the doctrines in the Liturgy and Occasional Services and Catechism

of the Church of England. These doubts ultimately produced in his mind the conviction that the baptismal doctrines of the Establishment were at variance with Holy Scripture, and he accordingly became a member of the Baptist denomination. Having acted for a short time as a city missionary in Liverpool, he was appointed minister of Myrtle Street Chapel, as assistant to Rev. James Lister. In 1848 he became sole pastor, following this venerable man, who had served the Church above forty years. Mr. Brown's ministry in the same congregation lasted for nearly the same period, and was wonderfully successful. No man in Liverpool possessed the confidence and affection of that great city more fully than he, and no man has done more to honor and bless it in all its forms of religious and benevolent life. His Church wielded a wide influence, and had grown under his pastoral labors from about three hundred communicants to almost a thousand, besides planting several branch churches and many Sunday-schools. As a preacher, Mr. Brown was strong, full of freshness and force and evangelical to the core. He was a sturdy Baptist, lovable, hospitable, generous to a fault, and without a tittle of cant in his nature. It would be hard to find a broader or truer man on earth, in all that makes true Christian manliness, than Hugh Stowell Brown. He died very suddenly at his home, February 24th, 1886, in the fullness of his strength. In person, he was large, very genial in his manner, racy as a conversationalist, true as a friend and eloquent as a preacher. His brethren loved to honor him, and in 1878 elected him President of the Baptist Union. His 'Lectures for the People,' which open all the elements of his character and genius, have reached a circulation of more than forty thousand, and it is in contemplation to erect a monument to his memory in the city which he so largely blessed.

ROBERT HALL, not the greatest scholar,

theologian, or leader of the Baptists, stands probably at the head of the British pulpit as a rhetorician and orator. His father was pastor of the Baptist Church at Arnsby, near Leicester, where Robert was born in 1764, being the youngest in a family of fourteen. From his birth to his death he was feeble in body, sensitive and nervous; at the age of two years he could neither talk nor walk, and near the close of his life he said that he remembered few hours when he had not been in pain amounting to agony. But so precocious was he mentally 'that his nurse taught him the alphabet from the tombstones of a neighboring' church-yard before he could talk plainly. As a boy, he displayed a passion for books, and at the age of ten is said to have read 'Edwards on the Will' and 'Butler's Analogy,' with a clear comprehension of their contents. At fifteen he entered Bristol College, where he made rapid progress and remained for three years. While there he made several attempts at oratory, with perfect and humiliating failure. In 1781 he entered the University of Aberdeen, where he remained for four years. Sir James Mackintosh was a fellow-student, but Hall outstripped all his fellows in the classics, philosophy and mathematics. He took his Master's Degree in 1785, and spent three years as classical tutor at Bristol, as well as assistant to Dr. Caleb Evans, pastor of Broadmead Chapel.

His eloquence won him fame, and the leading minds in that city were drawn around him in crowds, but his orthodoxy soon fell into question and not without reason. Consciously or unconsciously he was affected all his life by Socinian principles, not only on the Trinity and the personality of the Spirit, but on correlated doctrines. His admiration of Socinus was enthusiastic, as is seen on various points, and on none more clearly than in his novel views on baptism and communion, their relations to each other and to Apostolic Christianity. He not only

rejected the federal headship of Adam, but he held the semi-materialistic view that 'Man's thinking powers and faculties are the result of a certain organization of matter, and that after death he ceases to be conscious till the resurrection.' In 1790 he became pastor at Cambridge, successor to the distinguished Robert Robinson, where he remained fifteen years. There he stirred men of the highest mental powers and culture, and under the shadow of the University, with the reputation of 'Prince of the Pulpit,' he was stimulated to his highest efforts. In 1793 he published his great 'Apology for the Freedom of the Press,' which moved the whole country. Partial insanity overtook him, with entire bodily prostration, and he was compelled to resign his charge in 1806, not, however, before he had published his 'Modern Infidelity' (1801) and his 'Sentiments Proper to the Present Crisis' (1803), productions which, for their eloquence, carried his fame through the realm.

Recovering, from 1806 to 1819 he was pastor at Leicester. Here he published his 'Terms of Communion' in 1815, but in 1819 accepted the pastorate of Broadmead at Bristol, where he remained till his death, in 1831; when a post-mortem examination showed that his aggravated disease had made the last twenty years one slow martyrdom. His moral character and private life were delightfully attractive, but he was fond of controversy, in which he was extremely pertinacious and much given to the use of polished but keen satire. God had endowed him with all the native qualities of a great pulpit orator, and he had faithfully cultivated these as gifts from God. Though his health was so uncertain he had a powerful frame, which gave him that imposing presence which prepares the auditor to attach meaning to every word and action of a true orator. His voice was not remarkable for volume, but it was fitted by sweetness and flexibility to

express every emotion. His style in spoken discourse was easy and graceful, every thought being clothed in its appropriate language, and, as is natural, was without that smell of the lamp which marks his published works. His attempt there to be always labored and dignified often falls into the pompous, stilted and artificial. His private conversation is said to have been adorned by brilliant wit and other forms of relief, but he never allows one stroke of this to appear in his writings; yet, inadequately as they represent his genius, they are full of splendid rhetoric and thrilling eloquence.

His bias toward what is known as philosophical Socinianism was less apparent in his later life, and he even denied that it existed, with some show of reason, especially on the atonement. But in his view of the constitution of a Christian Church he is one with Socinus through and through, in that he confounds Church organization with personal Christian life, and sinks the first in the last for all practical purposes. Socinus, an Italian, born 1539, went into Poland, and in 1580 published his treatise on the question, 'Whether it is lawful for a Christian to be without water baptism?' He wrote other works on this and kindred subjects, making two Latin folio volumes of over 800 pages each; and this work occupies 30 pages, beginning at page 708, vol. i. He adopted a new position on the terms of communion, not only in opposition to all Christendom as it then existed, and had existed in all Christian history, but as it exists still; namely, that baptism is not a term of Church fellowship, and, therefore, that those who wish to enter the Church and share its privileges may do so in 'perfect union' without baptism at all. Socinus did not, with the Friends, reject both the ordinances, but held that the Supper is binding on the Christian, while baptism is not. This not only places the Supper in a false position, by making it of more consequence

than baptism, but it forces him to deny that baptism is an appointment of Christ. Mr. Hall did not agree with him in denying that baptism is a New Testament institution, but, on the contrary, he held that it is and that it is only properly administered to a believer by his immersion; but they were entirely one in teaching that baptism was not essential to the reception of the Supper; therefore, that Churches should admit to the Lord's table those who are not baptized, and whom they know to be unbaptized.

Any person who carefully compares Socinus and Hall, page by page and proposition by proposition, will be struck by the step-to-step movement which leads them to the same conclusion, and in many cases with an almost exact form of expressing the sentiment, as well as with the oneness of the sentiment itself. They both deny that baptism is necessary to full membership in the Church, and to participation in its discipline and government; they teach that there are essential and non-essential truths in Christianity, and that baptism, *per se*, ranks with the non-essential; they both maintain that Paul, the apostle, required Churches to tolerate the neglect of baptism, as an exercise of Christian liberty; they both deny that an external act, such as baptism, is to be exacted of a Christian in order to membership in the Church and a place at the Supper, for that true Christianity is governed only by the internal and spiritual, as if the Supper had no external character; they both claim that love and liberality demand the reception at the Table of the baptized and unbaptized alike; and they both insist on sincerity as the chief qualification for the Supper, in keeping with the altered 'genius' of Christianity and 'the age.' Hall's position – in so far as they differ on the enforcement of baptism as an apostolic injunction – is more dangerous than the assumption of Socinus, that the Scriptures do

not enjoin it at all; because it leaves the individual Christian as the supreme judge in the matter, as against the voice of the New Testament. It is this which makes his novel position so untraceable and yet beguiling. He tells us that '*the letter*' of Scripture requires men to be baptized, and he holds that all who are not immersed are not baptized, and yet, that it is displeasing to God and uncharitable to require them to obey Christ to 'the letter.' He denies that baptism is necessary to salvation, but implies that the Supper is; and it is a matter for gratitude that no body of Christians has yet adopted his ground, either in theory or practice, excepting those who follow him in the English Baptist Churches.

CHARLES HADDON SPURGEON, whose name is a household word the world over, is the most remarkable minister of Christ now living, taking all things into the account. He was born at Kelvedon, Essex, June 19th, 1834. His father and grandfather were Congregational pastors and his mother was an uncommonly earnest Christian, who took great pains to form the character and seek the salvation of her children. Charles's aunt, whom he named 'Mother Ann,' loved him tenderly and fostered him as her own child. Early he had a passion for books and pictures, and at the age of six delighted in Bunyan. The likeness of Bishop Bonner, whom he called 'Old Bonner,' stirred his dislike because of his cruelty; and as a child he manifested great self-possession, decision, strong passions and will. His education was limited, being confined chiefly to a private academy at Colchester, kept by Mr. Leeding, a Baptist, and to a year in an agricultural school at Maidstone. His parents pressed him to enter Cambridge, but he refused, on the conviction that duty called him to active life. At fifteen he became deeply interested in his salvation, and was converted on hearing a sermon preached from Isa. 45:22, by an unlettered Primitive

Methodist local preacher, in a little country chapel. He then became deeply interested in Bible baptism, and laid the matter before his father. Becoming convinced that it was his duty to be immersed on a confession of Christ, he walked from New Market to Isleham, seven miles, on May 3th, 1850, where Rev. Mr. Cantlow buried him with Christ in baptism. His mother mourned his loss to the Independents; and told him that she had prayed earnestly for his conversion, but not that he should be a Baptist. He replied: 'Well, dear mother, you know that the Lord is so good, that he always gives us more than we can ask or think.'

At this time, he was a tutor in Mr. Leeding's school at New Market, which school was removed to Cambridge, and young Spurgeon accompanied it there, becoming a member of the Baptist Church in St. Andrew's Street, where Robert Hall had so long been pastor. That Church had a 'Lay Preachers' Association,' for the supply of thirteen neighboring villages with preaching. Of this he became a member, preaching his first sermon in a cottage at Teversham. From the first crowds flocked to hear the 'Boy Preacher,' and at eighteen he became pastor of the Baptist Church at Waterbeach, a village of about 1,300 people. His fame soon reached London, and he was invited to preach at the New Park Street Chapel in 1853, where, by a unanimous call, he became successor to Gill, Rippon and other worthies. His success was immediate and wonderful; without parallel he sprang to the highest rank, but not without the severest trials. He possessed some youthful eccentricities, which to the eyes of many staid folk savored of boldness and self-conceit. On this plea, every sort of indecent attack was made upon him; he was denounced

as a 'young clown,' 'mountebank,' etc., without stint, and the writer well remembers the time, when but two or three ministers in London treated him with common respect, to say nothing of Christian courtesy. But God was with him, and that was enough; his ministry has simply been a marvel, all the solemn nobodies notwithstanding. His talent for organization and administration is very large; his heart is all tenderness for destitute children, hence his orphanages; is all sympathy for poor young ministers, hence his college; and his head is a miracle amongst heads for common sense, hence his magnetic influence. Without starch, self-conceit or sanctimonious clap-trap, he acts on living conviction. As a preacher, he deals only in what Christ and his apostles thought worthy of their attention; tells what he knows about God and man, sin and holiness, time and eternity, in pure ringing Saxon; uses voice enough to make people hear, speaks out like a man to men, lodging his words in their ears and hearts, instead of making his own throat or nose their living sepulcher. He fills his mind with old Gospel truth, and his memory with old Puritanic thought, calls the fertility of his imagination into use, believes in Jesus Christ with all the power of his being, loves the souls of men with all his heart and acts accordingly. He carries the least amount of religion possible in the whites of his eyes, but a living well of it in the depth of his soul; and the real wonder is not that God has put such honor upon him, for if his life had been very different from what it has been, even partial failure in the hands of such a man of God would have been a new and unsolvable mystery in the reign of a faithful Christ.

Chapter 10 - The Scotch and English Baptists – Missions – Men of Note

Chapter 11 - British Baptists – The Welsh Baptists

The works of Welsh bards form the best annals of Wales down to the fourteenth century, but as they trace no line of 'heretics,' it is difficult to tell what isolated lights shone there through the Dark Ages. Nowhere in Europe was the moral night darker than in Wales in those ages. The ignorance and depravity of the Welsh clergy were shocking. Even as late as 1560 Meyrick, Bishop of Bangor, said that in all his diocese there were but two clergymen who preached. At that time the clergy were allowed to marry, but by paying a pension they could keep concubines, and a large number of his clergy kept them. Strype, in his 'Life of Archbishop Parker,' says that in 1565 two Welsh Bishops were to be appointed for the sees of Bangor and Llandaff. The queen left the archbishop to name the men for these vacancies, but he found it difficult to secure honest clergymen to fill them, and he was earnestly pressed to appoint a man to Bangor who openly kept three concubines. The primate found it necessary to commission Dr. Yale to visit that bishopric before he ventured to appoint any one. Besides, there was no Bible there and the Reformation itself scarcely affected Wales for nearly a century. For thirty years after Elizabeth had established Protestantism by law there was no Bible in the Welsh tongue. Portions of the Scriptures were translated into manuscript before the Reformation, but some of them were lost. Taliesin, a bard of note in the sixth century, gave a paraphrase in verse of a few passages, and it is said that there was a manuscript translation of the Gospels in the library of St. Asaph's Cathedral. In the latter part of the thirteenth century it was already looked upon as old, and the Archbishop of Canterbury allowed the priests to exhibit it as a sacred thing. Bishop Goldwell, of St. Asaph, was deprived of his see on the accession of Elizabeth, because he

refused to become a Protestant and went to Rome, taking the manuscript with him. He died there, and possibly it is in the Vatican today. Dafydd Ddu, another bard, wrote a poetical paraphrase in the fourteenth century on a part of the Psalms, the song of Zacharias, the angel's greeting to Mary and the song of Simeon, found in Luke's Gospel. Some other fragments of Scripture were given by others. But Dr. Llewelyn says, in his 'History of Welsh Versions,' that 'for upward of seventy years from the settlement of the Reformation by Queen Elizabeth, for near one hundred years from Britain's separation from the Church of Rome, there were no Bibles in Wales, but only in the cathedrals or in the parish churches and chapels.' The first Welsh New Testament, made chiefly by Salesbury, was printed in London in 1567, and dedicated to Elizabeth. It was published at the expense of Humphrey Toy. The whole Bible, translated by William Morgan, was first printed in Welsh in 1588.

Davis, Bishop of Monmouth, finds a wide difference between the Christianity of the ancient Britons and that of Austin in 596. The first followed the word of God, the other was mixed with human tradition. Dr. Fulk denied that Austin was the apostle of England, and charges him with corrupting the true Christianity which he found in Britain, by Romish admixture. Fabian, himself a Catholic, shows that he imposed sundry things upon the Britons, which were refused as contrary to the doctrine that they had at first received. Bede says that the Culdees followed the Bible only and opposed the superstitions of Rome. Culdee, from Culdu, is a compound Welsh word, cul, thin, du, black; and means a thin, dark man, as their mountaineers, who were noted for their godliness. The monks got possession of the Culdee colleges by degrees, and continued to preach without forming churches. Some claim

Chapter 11 - British Baptists – The Welsh Baptists

that the Welsh Baptists sprang from this sturdy stock; for individuals are found in Glamorgan, the Black Mountains, Hereford and Brecon Counties, who walked apart from Rome before the Reformation. Stephens, the late antiquarian of Merthyr, thought that the bards of the Chavi of Glamorgan kept up a secret intercourse with the Albigenses. This is probable, as some of them were conversant with the Italian poets.

'Holy Rhys,' famous in 1390, was learned, and his wife was of the 'new faith' (Lollard), for his son, Iueun, was expelled from Margam Monastery for holding their opinions, or 'on account of his mother's religion.' His grandson also was imprisoned by Sir Matthew Cradock for being of the 'new faith.' Another bard and 'prophet,' Thomas Llewelyn, was, according to an old manuscript, the first preacher to a congregation of dissenters in Wales, or, rather, he had three congregations. Sion Kent, otherwise Dr. John Gwent, a poet-priest of about that time, wrote a satirical poem, called 'An Ode to Another Book,' in which he charges said book with fifteen dangerous heresies, and warns it to remember the fall of Oldcastle. This seems to have been a highly-prized Lollard book, known as the 'Lanthorn of Light,' for possessing a copy of which Cleydon, of London, was burnt. The Lollards swarmed in Wales, where Oldcastle hid for four years after escaping from the Tower. He was a native of the Welsh Cottian Alps, the Black Mountains, having been born at Old Castle about 1360. It is in dispute as to when and where Baptists first appeared in Wales. There are presumptive evidences that individuals held their views from the opening of the seventeenth century, and some have thought that the first Baptist Church was formed at Olchon, 1633. Joshua Thomas, of Leominster, perhaps the most reliable authority on the subject, doubts this. He leans to the belief that there were Baptists there at that date, but says: 'The first Baptist Church in

Wales, after the Reformation, was formed at Ilsten, near Swansea, in Glamorganshire, in 1649.' Howell Vaughan preached at Olchon, 1633, and it is a curious fact that the first Non-conformists of Wales sprang up in the little valley, near Old Castle, embosomed in these Black Mountains, where this noble old 'heretic' lived.

The vale of Olchon is difficult of access, and there the first Welsh dissidents found the most ready converts, who sheltered themselves in its rocks and dens. The Darren Ddu, or Black Rock, is a terribly steep and rough place, in which the Baptists took refuge, rich and poor, young and old, huddled together. It was under the Commonwealth that Vavasor Powell, Jenkin Jones and Hugh Evans formed the first Open Communion Baptist Churches in Wales, and that John Miles formed the first Strict Communion Baptist Churches there. The first Welsh Baptist Association was organized in 1651. John Miles is first mentioned February 23d, 1649, in an 'Act of Parliament for the better propagation of the Gospel in Wales.' He is named with Powell, Jones and twenty-two others, as 'approvers,' to superintend preaching in the principality. He left the clergy of the State Church and became a Baptist leader, marked for his learning and piety. He went to America and we shall meet him there.

VAVASOR POWELL was one of the strongest characters of his age. He was born of one of the best families in Wales, 1617; was graduated at Jesus College, Oxford, and entered the Established Church, as curate to his uncle, in Shropshire. One day a Puritan reproved him for breaking the Sabbath by taking part in the 'Sports,' and this led to his conversion after two years of mental agony for his sins. In 1641 he began to preach the Gospel in earnest, but, his life being threatened, he fled to London in 1642, and joined the Parliamentary army as chaplain. After preaching two years in Kent he

returned to Wales, bearing a certificate from the Assembly of Divines as an accredited preacher. It bore date September 11th, 1646, and was signed by the proclator, the marshal and fifteen others, amongst whom were Christopher Love and Joseph Caryl. In Wales he preached as an itinerant, a prevailing system there, for the Churches were made up of many branches, far apart. The 'Committee for Plundered Ministers' paid him a salary of £66 10.s. per annum. They supported many such itinerants, but for learning, energy and success he excelled them all. He was constantly in the pulpit and the saddle, preaching two or three times a day, in two or three places, riding more than a hundred miles a week. There was scarcely a place in Wales where he did not preach, in church, chapel, market-place or field, during the fourteen years of liberty, 1646 to 1660; yet at that time there was not a Dissenting place of worship in Wales. Some say that the first built by the Baptists was at Hay, near Olchon, 1649; but, according to Thomas, the first was at Llanwenarth, in 1695. Powell was immersed and became a Baptist in 1656. In his 'Confession of Faith' he teaches that baptism is immersion, and believers its only subjects; but he did not hold it as the boundary of Church communion, nor were his Churches in the Baptist Association. Notwithstanding this no man fired the hatred of the Church party as he did, and no man's character was more aspersed than his, till death relieved him, October 27th, 1671. It is said that by 1660 he had formed twenty-two Churches in Wales, and had twenty thousand followers, most likely an exaggerated statement. Many of his troubles sprang from his resistance of Cromwell's later assumptions. He had denounced him from the pulpit in Blackfriars, for which cause he was arrested, he suffered every kind of persecution for preaching, and spent eight years in thirteen prisons, dying in the Fleet. His 'Confession' of

thirty articles is given in a treatise, entitled 'The Bird in the Cage, Chirping.' In this he gives the faith of the Welsh Churches which he founded.

JENKIN JONES, commonly called 'captain,' was another grand sample of this early Welsh independence and suffering for Christ. He was a gentleman of property and education, who had been in the army of the Commonwealth. He raised a troop of a hundred and twenty horse for Cromwell, arming and equipping them himself. With these he kept the king's friends in Breckonshire under subjection, often appearing with the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other. Walker says that he was incumbent in his native parish, and Calamy, that he was rejected from his living, so the Church party berated him as a 'violent Anabaptist.' His presence and address were majestic; and once when going to preach in Monmouthshire, a soldier of the royal army waylaid him to kill him, but was so struck with his comeliness and bearing, that his heart failed; he heard him preach and was converted. After the Restoration his estates were confiscated, and he was imprisoned at Caermarthen. We have no account of his death.

These sketches of the real founders of the Baptist denomination in Wales will help us the better to understand the following facts. Before the death of Powell the Open Communion Baptists were much the most numerous in Wales, but after that they gradually declined. The Ilsten Church records give the following account of the organization of that Church. A Baptist Church was meeting in the Glasshouse; Broad Street, London, of which William Consett and Edward Draper were members. Miles and Thomas Proud visited this Church just when they were praying God to send more laborers into the vineyard, and these two were sent back to Wales as missionaries. On the 1st of October, 1649, they formed a regular Baptist Church at Ilsten as the result. This book claims

that this was the first Church of baptized believers in the principality.

It says: 'When there had been no company or society of people holding forth and professing the doctrine, worship, order, and discipline of the Gospel, according to the primitive institution, that ever we heard of in all Wales, since the apostasy, it pleased the Lord to choose this dark corner to place his name in, and honor us, undeserving creatures, with the happiness of being the first in all these parts, among whom was practiced the glorious ordinance of baptism, and here to gather the first Church of baptized believers.' Jane Lloyd and Elizabeth Proud were the first converts baptized here, but in eleven years the Church grew to two hundred and sixty members under the ministry of Miles. He also preached with great success in all the region round about, and various Churches were formed in that part of Wales. A very bitter controversy sprang up between the Strict Communion and Open Churches, and Thomas Proud was expelled for laxity on that subject by the strict brethren. After a time the Open Churches dwindled away, or fell into Pedobaptist bodies, a natural tendency. Some Baptist ministers even went so far as to accept State payment by church tithes, under the act of 1649, for the propagation of the Gospel in Wales. These were itinerants who traveled at large, and were paid by the 'Committee of the Sequestered Livings.' It may be interesting to give a copy of the certificate issued to Thomas Evans, great-grandfather of Dr. Caleb Evans:

'By the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales. Whereas, five of the ministers, in the Act of Parliament named, bearing date the 25th of February, 1649, and entitled "An Act for the better Propagation of the Gospel in Wales," have, according to the tenors of the said act, approved of Mr. Thomas Evans the younger, to be a person qualified for

the work of the ministry, and recommended him with their advice to us, that he be encouraged in the work of the ministry; we do, according to an order to us directed by the committee of five at Neath, therefore order that *Mr. John Pryce*, Treasurer, shall forthwith pay unto the said *Thomas Evans* the sum of £30, which we have thought fit to allow him towards his salary and encouragement in the work of the ministry. And this our order, together with his acquittance, shall be a sufficient discharge for the said Treasurer. Dated under our hands, the 16th of May, in the year of our Lord 1653. *John Williams*, Secretary.'

As soon as the Baptists saw that they had compromised their principles by this blunder, they retreated from their false position, and Powell says that he and many of his brethren 'did not take any salary at all, nor any other maintenance whatever since the year 1653.' Powell published a severe attack upon Cromwell's policy in 1655, under the title 'Word for God,' signed by three hundred and twenty-one Welshmen, most of whom were Baptists. This was a solemn protest against the 'new modeling of ministers' as 'antichristian,' and against the 'keeping up of parishes and tithes, as a popish invention.' The Llanwenarth Church felt so deeply on this matter that they entered the following on their church book: 'Whether Gospel ministers may receive payment from the magistrates.' Mr. William Pritchard (their minister) was advised to reject the offer of State money, and this record was agreed to on 'the 11th day of the 5th month, 1655, and also, that they (the Church) do withdraw from all such ministers that do receive maintenance from the magistrates, and from all such as consent not to wholesome doctrine, or teach otherwise.' As this was a branch of the Abergavenny Church and a member of the Association, it is fair to suppose that this was the general sentiment on the subject of State ministers and their reception of

State money for ministerial services.

The distinctive tenets of the Baptists, their zeal and rapid progress in the principality, stirred up a formidable opposition, which took the honorable form of public debate. One such discussion took place in St. Mary's Parish Church, Abergavenny, September 5th, 1653. The subject was 'Believer's Baptism,' and John Tombes disputed first with Henry Vaughan, then with John Cragge. Their arguments were afterward published. Wood says of Tombes: 'He showed himself a most excellent disputant, a person of incomparable parts, well versed in the Hebrew and Greek languages.' He also speaks of a similar debate with Baxter, thus: 'All scholars there and then present, who knew the way of disputing and managing arguments, did conclude that Tombes got the better of Baxter by far.' Probably this was the first debate on baptism in Wales, and Joshua Thomas says that more than forty persons were immersed into the Church in Abergavenny that year. But in proportion as the Baptists grew, they were assailed by pen and tongue from all quarters, and in 1656 the elders and messengers of eight Churches met at Brecon and published 'An Antidote against the Times,' in self-defense. This was probably the first Welsh Baptist book. They speak with the greatest gratitude 'of thousands of poor, ignorant, straying people' brought to Christ, and of three editions of the New Testament, and 'six thousand copies of the whole Bible,' circulated in fourteen years, since some religious liberty was enjoyed in Wales. At this time, eight Churches belonged to the Association, besides the 'Powell Baptists,' and the 'Evans' people who did not belong to it; and Thomas mentions the names of thirty Baptist ministers in Wales under the Commonwealth. But from the ascent of Charles II, May 29th, 1660, we hear no more of the Association for eight and twenty years. Persecution raged furiously against all Nonconformists in Wales,

and the Baptists became, as usual, the special subjects of hate, storm and chains; prisons and doom became their gloomy fate. Before the end of June, the king's wrath burst upon the Nonconformists of Wales, followed by a series of the most iniquitous ordinances that despotism could desire. The year 1662 brought the Act of Uniformity; 1664, the Conventicle Act; 1665, the Five Mile Act; and 1673, the Test Act. Under one pretense or another, butchery held high carnival for these years. Yet, thousands would not bow the knee, and amongst them, some of the noblest Baptists that ever Wales produced. During this hot persecution the Welsh Baptists sent a petition to the king, which was presented to him personally by a member of Parliament from Caermarthen. They say: 'We dare not walk the streets, and are abused even in our own houses. If we pray to God with our families, we are threatened to be hung. Some of us are stoned almost to death, and others imprisoned for worshiping God according to the dictates of our consciences and the rule of his word.' The king, with characteristic heartlessness, sent them a polite answer, full of fair promises, but paid no more attention to the matter, and their sufferings increased day by day.

Excommunication carried with it the denial of burial in the parish church-yards, so that the Baptists were obliged to bury their dead in their own gardens, or where they could, generally in secret and at night. A godly woman in Radnorshire had been excommunicated for not attending that parish church, but had been secretly buried in its burying-ground. The enraged parson, however, had her body taken from its grave and dragged to the cross-roads, to be buried as a malefactor. There her friends erected a stone to mark the spot, but it was demolished. Yet, even in this period of fiery persecution, we have the history of a new Baptist Church, formed under singular

circumstances of persecution and hatred. WILLIAM JONES, a Presbyterian, was ejected from his parish in 1660, and imprisoned for three years in Caermarthen Castle. During that time he became a Baptist, and when liberated he went to Olchon to be immersed. On returning home he preached his new faith and, on the 4th of August, 1661, baptized Griffith Howells and five others. Howells was wealthy and educated, and on the 25th, five more persons were immersed. By July 12th, 1668, the number had increased to thirty-one, who were organized into a Church, of which Jones and Howells were elected joint elders. In 1777, one century afterward, this Church had so branched out into the counties of Pembroke, Caermarthen and Cardigan that it numbered 1767 members. Interesting accounts might be given of the local Churches of the several counties, but they are all much the same: a history of oppression, decadence, division and providential intervention. Sometimes cases of excessive barbarity are put on record, and others of wonderful deliverance.

The Welsh Baptists found relief in the Toleration Act of 1689, which protects them in their worship to this day, and under its provisions they left the rocks and other hiding places. Their brethren in London invited them to a conference in October of that year, where about a hundred Churches were represented; seven ministers went up from Wales and the Assembly set forth a Confession of Faith. The Welsh Association, consisting of ten Churches, reassembled at Llanwenarth, May 6th, 1700, and continued to grow, so that almost every county has now an Association of its own. At first, the official language of these bodies was English, but since 1708, the vernacular has been used. The annual meeting of the first Association was held in Whitsun-week, the first day being spent in prayer and fasting. The 'Associational Sermon' was introduced in 1703,

and in time, preaching became the chief feature of the meetings, until now, from ten to fifteen sermons are preached at such gatherings. Our brethren resorted much to fasting and prayer at their associational meetings, especially when heresy and contention crept in, or where two Churches were at variance. In such cases, all the Churches were called upon to hold a day of prayer and fasting; and in 1723, when two Churches were in a fight, 'the first Wednesday in each month, for half a year, was appointed for fasting and prayer, on account of this distressing affair.' Then when the contest ended, 'the Churches were desired to observe days of thanks-giving for what was done.' Prayer and fasting form an excellent remedy for that 'demon;' would that all church fighters would take a vow neither to eat nor drink till their fight was ended; this would happily rid us of most of them within forty days.

The death of Queen Anne and the accession of George I, 1714, prevented the passage of the 'Schism Bill,' and the Welsh Baptists kept the anniversary of that day with thanksgiving for many years. At the time of the Revolution, so-called (1688), there were eleven Baptist Churches in Wales, ten of which are named by Joshua Thomas, the eleventh being a very strong Church, under the pastoral care of William Jones, in the counties of Pembroke and Caermarthen, formed in that year. By the year 1735 these had increased to sixteen. But this statement is misleading, unless we bear in mind that each Church, so-called, was made up of many congregations, all under one pastor, who had many assistants, in some cases six or eight, and in one case eleven. The Churches did not report the number of members to the Association, but the separate Church records, which have been preserved, show, that there were several hundred communicants in a number of these Churches, and the names of forty-two ministers are given who labored in

them between 1700 and 1736; all Strict Communionists, many of them men of might. Besides those who remained in Wales, large numbers of Baptists migrated to America, and took a leading part in establishing the denomination here, as we shall find.

About 1692, Baptist sentiments had taken such a strong hold in the western part of the principality, that warm controversies arose with the Pedobaptists, especially the Independents. Several debates were had; then both sides agreed to preach on baptism at Penlan. John Thomas, an Independent, preached on infant baptism, and John Jenkins, a Baptist, on believer's baptism. The result was, that so many Independents were immersed as rendered it desirable for them to ask Samuel Jones, a Presbyterian, and a fine scholar, to write in defense of infant baptism; but, as he declined, James Owen, of Oswestry, undertook that work. In 1693 he published 'Infant Baptism from Heaven,' perhaps the first book in the Welsh tongue on that subject. In answer, Benjamin Keach published 'Light broke forth in Wales.' Another controversy of the same sort took place about 1726, between Miles Harris for the Baptists and Edmund Jones for the Pedobaptists. These combatants belabored each other full soundly and kept the country in a turmoil until a convention was called of leaders from both sides, in which they agreed to respect each other for the future, and try to behave decently. This agreement was duly signed by three Baptists and six Pedobaptists, properly attested by five other ministers and printed in 1728. But, alas for the weakness of Welsh Pedobaptist nature! Fowler Walker, the Independent minister of Abergavenny; the first attestor to this awful document, could not keep his pen still, but in 1732 published a tract on 'Infant Baptism;' and then, alas for the Baptist Association! in response it published 'Doe's Tract of Forty Texts from the New Testament

on Believer's Baptism.' And, as if this were not enough, Brother David Rees, of London, sent a letter to Brother Walker, promising that his book should be further considered at leisure. Accordingly, in 1734, he published his 'Infant Baptism no Institution of Christ's; and the Rejection of it Justified by Scripture and Antiquity.' Whereupon, thereafter, Brother Walker found it comfortable to keep still.

After this the Welsh Baptists, who were principally firm, hyper-Calvinists holding the quinquarticular points, had a warm controversy amongst themselves on Arminianism. The 'Arminian Heresy,' as it was called, was creeping in, however, and at least three ministers were affected thereby. The chief point in dispute was whether it was the duty of sinners to turn to God, because of their obligations to the moral law. But in 1733 Enoch Francis had the good sense to publish his 'Word in Season,' in which he took the moderate Calvinistic ground, so ably presented afterward by Andrew Fuller, namely: That the atonement of Christ is sufficient for all mankind, but that its efficacy is confined to the elect only, and that the offer of salvation is, therefore, to be made to all who hear the Gospel. This position softened the controversy, but it continued down to the present century, and made great trouble in Churches which had more than one minister, who disagreed on the subject. At Hengoed, Morgan Griffith was a stanch Calvinist, but Charles Winter, his co-pastor, was a thorough Arminian, and they debated the matter warmly. It was arranged that Winter should not preach anything contrary, to Griffith, which arrangement held good till Griffith's death in 1738, when the Church expelled Winter and twenty-four others with him, who formed an Arminian Baptist Church, near Merthyr Tydvil, which, however, soon became extinct. Other Churches had similar troubles.

It is interesting to trace the history of

ministerial education amongst the Welsh Baptists. The Pembrokeshire Church at a very early date was called 'The College,' because of the many ministers whom it sent forth; and probably it had some system of training peculiar to itself. Young Baptist ministers were trained at Samuel Jones's private Presbyterian Seminary for a while, but about 1732 the Baptists established one of their own near Pontypool. This school was founded chiefly by Morgan Griffith and Miles Harris, two most enterprising and liberal spirits, and was of immense service to the Baptist ministry until 1770, when the Bristol College was established and this Seminary was given up. One of its best-known students out of a list of forty powerful names was DR. THOS. LLEWELYN, a descendant of the Welsh Bible translator. He finished his studies in London and became president of a Baptist Academy there, which prepared men for the ministry. In 1696 he raised subscriptions for and induced the 'Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge' to issue twenty thousand Welsh Bibles. He also wrote a 'History of Welsh Versions,' and a work on 'The British Tongue' in its relation to other languages, and to the 'Welsh Bible.' Dr. Rippon says that Gibbon remarked to him, when speaking of linguists: 'I think, my young friend, that Dr. Llewelyn is the first scholar we have among the Protestant Dissenters.'

If space permitted, it would be a pleasant task to give the narrative of large numbers of the Welsh Baptist fathers, with their notable sayings and doings, many of them being amongst the most eminent of their day; learned, zealous for the truth and its able defenders, whose Gospel ministry was marked by great power from above in the salvation of men. In this list would stand prominent the names of Lewis Thomas, William Pritchard, Enoch Francis, Morgan Griffith, Caleb Evans of Pentre and his ten illustrious descendants in the

ministry, with John Harris. These and many others fought the good fight for toleration and conquered; for by 1715 one eighth of the Welsh were Non-conformists, and a much larger proportion by 1736. In 1794 the number of Baptist Churches in Wales was fifty-six, with 7,050 members; but in 1798, the churches numbered eighty-four, with 9,000 members, divided for convenience into the Northern, Eastern and Western Associations. They had passed through many contentions, on the Sandemanian, Socinian and Arian questions, as well as on the subject of Communion. For a time Sandemanianism wrought great mischief amongst the Welsh Churches, many of the pastors, amongst them Christmas Evans, being almost blinded by its pretensions. In the opening of the nineteenth century, the leading men of the denomination became involved in a warm controversy concerning the Atonement and Redemption; and Christmas Evans published a book in 1811, in which he gave what was called 'a commercial aspect' to the Atonement. He set forth that the atoning death of Christ is of equal weight with the sins of the elect; while others took the ground that its effects were twofold, bearing on the sins of the world in general, and on those of the elect in particular. At that point in the controversy Richard Foulkes, the Baptist pastor at Newbridge, and John Phillips Davies, the pastor at Tredegar, who had embraced the doctrines of Andrew Fuller, came to their defense, many others joined them and the debate ran high. The result was that the Welsh Baptists became more distinguished from that period for biblical teaching than for systematic theology; and today no Churches hail truth in its simplicity, freedom, amplitude and warmth, in the form given to it by the divine Oracles, more heartily than do the Baptists of Wales. They hold the doctrines of grace and the responsibility of man by a strong and clear grasp which honors them

amongst the Churches of Christ, and they unhesitatingly maintain every other principle which is vital to Bible Baptists. The number of public debates held on Baptism, and the works published on that subject by our Welsh brethren, has been endless. But the most able production of all is 'The Act of Baptism,' from the pen of the late Dr. Hugh Jones, published in 1882. It will long remain a standard work.

We have already seen that the Baptists of Wales became interested early in educational plans, and we find Morgan Griffith, of Hengoed, establishing the Trosnant Academy as early as 1732-34. Joshua Thomas kept a school also at Leominster for many years, and prepared students for the Bristol Academy; but his successor, Samuel Kilpin, opened a regular academy there in 1805, from which sprang some of the first men in the denomination. The Abergavenny College was founded in the year 1807, with Micah Thomas for its president, who sent forth six hundred and six ministers of such character that he won for the institution the confidence and support of all the Churches. Thomas was a noble and indefatigable worker and a fine scholar, he baptized over 400 persons, and preached about 5,500 sermons, besides doing his pastoral work at Abergavenny and his presidential duties. He died in 1853, aged seventy-five.

Pontypool College is a continuation of this. Its buildings were erected in 1836, and have since been enlarged, making them very inviting. Dr. Thomas was president for forty-one years, then was succeeded by William Lewis, A.M., who died in 1880, the chair being filled at present by William Edwards, B.A., assisted by David Thomas, B.A., as classical tutor. Haverfordwest College was established in 1839, David Davis being its first president, who filled the place till his death, in 1856. Thos. Davis succeeded him and still retains his place, with T.W. Davis, B.A., as classical tutor.

Llangollen College dates from 1862, Drs. John Fritchard and Hugh Jones having served it as presidents, but since the death of the latter, G. Davis is the sole tutor. In order that the Churches may secure all possible advantages from the Universities of the principality, the managers of the above-named three colleges have affiliated them more closely with those institutions; the students of Pontypool now obtain their classical training at Cardiff, those of Haverfordwest at Aberystwyth, and those of Llangollen at Bangor.

The Baptist Building Fund for Wales, organized in 1862, with a capital of £6,932 11s., for the purpose of making free loans to the Churches, payable in annual installments of ten per cent, is doing a grand work. The Welsh Baptist Union, formed in 1866, now representing the whole of the Welsh Churches, is a useful body. It meets annually in August or September, publishes a quarterly magazine, and an Annual Hand-Book for the denomination. Besides these, the Baptists publish three monthlies and two weeklies. According to the returns for the year 1886, their numerical strength in Wales is: Churches, 590; members, 73,828; attendance on Sunday-schools, 74,830. The denomination is thoroughly united, marches boldly forward upholding God's word as the only rule of faith, against all human ritual and tradition; with a very bright future in view.

This chapter cannot be completed without a few sketches of some of the fathers and leaders in Welsh Baptist history, but these must be limited to a few representative men of their several classes.

JOSHUA THOMAS is celebrated as their leading historian. He was born at Caio, 1719, but at the age of twenty resided at Hereford. At that time he did not profess religion, but yet walked thirteen miles to Leominster to worship with the Baptists every other Sunday. He was baptized there in 1740, and entered the ministry

in 1746; he afterward became pastor at Leominster, where he remained for fifty years. He wrote a 'History of the Welsh Baptists,' also a 'History of the Baptist Association in Wales,' being better acquainted with these subjects than any man of his day.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, justice of the peace and a deputy lieutenant of the counties of Cardigan and Pembroke. Born, 1732; died, 1799. His parents were wealthy Episcopalians, but, leaving him an orphan at the age of six, he was educated in the best manner under trustees. He married young but lost his wife, and was led to Christ by this affliction, entering the ministry. In Cardigan he built a commodious chapel and filled it with devout hearers. He labored under the odious Test and Corporation Acts, but yet was appointed to civil office under the government. The law required him to qualify by taking the Lord's Supper in the Established Church within a year of his appointment, and annually thereafter, but he filled his office for many years without submission to this test of conformity. He moved in the higher classes of society, and for a long period served as Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, and when he died his loss as a magistrate was mourned as national.

MORGAN JOHN RHEES was the Welsh Baptist hero of religious liberty. Born at Graddfa, 1760; after his baptism at Hengoed he went to the Bristol Academy, and entered the ministry in 1787. Before going to Bristol he established night-schools and Sunday-schools, far and near, teaching the pupils himself gratis, in chapels, barns and other places, and supplying them with books. When he became a pastor he aroused the denomination to the need of Sunday-schools before any other denomination had taken them up in Wales. Aided by others he founded a society in 1792 for the circulation of the Bible in France, believing that the Revolution had prepared that

people for the Gospel. But this work was arrested by the war of 1793. This is the first attempt known to form a Bible Society for purely missionary purposes, as he connected with it a mission to Bologne. This failing, he left France and threw himself into the effort to maintain the doctrine of political liberty and religious equality in Wales. He established the 'Cylchgrawn,' a magazine, which eulogized the American Constitution, and demanded that religious support in Wales should be patterned by that in the United States. Spies were put upon his track, and an officer from London appeared at Caermarthen for his arrest. His landlord misled the officer, and gave Rhees a hint that he had better make for Liverpool, whence he left for America, where he was welcomed by Dr. Rogers, of Philadelphia. There he took a band of Welsh emigrants into the Allegheny Mountains in 1797, and organized them into a Church at Beulah, Cambria County, Pa. He died at Somerset, December 7th, 1804.

JOSEPH HARRIS (Gomer), pastor at Swansea, was born 1773. So great was his thirst for knowledge, that, without any early educational advantages, he became one of the chief men of letters in the nation and wielded great influence. He first made his mark as a controversial theologian in various pamphlets, and in his work on 'The Proper Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ,' published in 1816. Bishop Burgess and other eminent members of the English clergy pronounced high eulogies upon this book. At that time no magazine or weekly was published in Welsh, and in 1814 Harris established the 'Star of Gomer,' a weekly; in that language. As a weekly this enterprise failed, but in 1818 he started a monthly under the same name, which met with great success. It was so broad and thorough in its discussions that it attained national celebrity, and earned for him the title 'Father of Welsh Journalism.' He

also published a Welsh and English Bible; and a hymn book for his own denomination, which is yet in use. He came to his grave in sorrow, some say of a broken heart, for the loss of his favorite son, whose memoirs he wrote in grief and tears, making its composition one of the most touching productions in the Welsh tongue.

CHRISTMAS EVANS, the prince of Welsh preachers, was born on the 25th of December, 1766, and named after that day. His father was very poor, and died when Christmas was about the age of nine, leaving him in such neglect that he could not read when he was fifteen. Mourning this ignorance he resolved to learn, and soon plodded through 'Pilgrim's Progress.' At eighteen he was converted and united with the Arminian Presbyterians. Soon he held religious services in cottages, having memorized one of Bishop Beveridge's sermons and one of Mr. Roland's. These were delivered in such a wonderful manner, that when a hearer knew them to be mere recitations, he remarked that 'there must be something in that unlettered boy, for the prayer was as good as the sermon.' Alas! master, that also was taken from a book. Evans went to school for a time to Rev. Mr. Davis, but, having no means to prosecute his studies, started for England to labor as a farmer in the harvest-field. Discouraged, he nearly abandoned the idea of entering the ministry, and, in fact, became almost indifferent to religion. Just then he fell into the hands of a mob, and received a blow which left him insensible, and his right eye blind for life. His narrow escape aroused him to new diligence, and shortly after he was immersed on his faith in Christ in the river Duar, by Rev. Timothy Thomas, and united with the Baptist Church at Aberduar. At the age of twenty-two he was ordained at Lleyrn as the pastor of five small Baptist Churches there. Frequently he walked twenty miles and preached four or five times on the Sabbath with marked results, he was

captivated by the preaching of Robert Roberts, a hunch-backed Calvinistic Methodist, of marked eccentricities, and said that from him he had 'obtained the keys of the level,' whatever that may be. In a short time Evans evinced remarkable preaching powers. He traveled on foot through town and village, crowds gathering into chapels and burying-grounds, on week-days and in the midst of harvest, while many were converted and immersed. His fame spread on the wings of the winds, and multitudes followed him from place to place.

In 1791 he removed to the isle of Anglesea, taking charge of the two Baptist Churches there, on a salary of £17 per annum. Besides the two chapels, he had eight preaching stations and no other Baptist minister near him. The Churches were in a cold and distracted state, but his labors were soon followed by powerful religious revivals. In 1794 he went far to attend the meetings of the Association, which met at Velin Voel, in the open air and in the hottest of weather. Two ministers had preached in a tedious way and the heat had almost stupefied the people, when Evans commenced the third sermon. In a few minutes the people began to weep and praise God, to leap and clap their hands for joy, and the greatest excitement continued through the entire day and night, the crowd saying to each other: 'The one-eyed man of Anglesea is a prophet sent from God!' For years he attended the meetings of this body, and here he preached his famous sermon on the demoniac of Gadara. That sermon held the vast throng spell-bound for three hours; for Christmas drew such a picture before them as even Jean Paul Richter never drew. The vast throng was beside itself, numbers threw themselves on the ground, as if an earthquake rocked beneath them. They had a clear vision of the naked maniac, full of burning anger and wild gesture, with fiend's eyes, fierce and full of flame. They saw his paroxysms which broke

the chains that held him, as threads of tow, when he bounded away like a wild beast, to leap upon harmless men. He lived in rocks, slept in tombs with the dead, haunted these dismal abodes like a midnight ghost and made them echo with loud blasphemies. All feared him as a demon and none dared approach him. His wife was broken-hearted, and his children desolate. In lucid moments he was gentle, then he roared like a lion, howled like a wolf, raved like a tiger, the terror of Gadara; until Jesus came, quelled the storm, restored the tortured mind and filled the land with joy. Then came his picture of the swine wallowing in destruction, the punishment of their selfish owners and great doctrinal truths, which produced an effect scarcely credible, but for full and clear testimony.

In 1826, when the preaching stations in Anglesea had increased to scores and the preachers to twenty-eight, he left that island and settled as pastor at Caerphilly, where he soon added one hundred and forty members to his Church by baptism. He remained here but two years when he removed to Cardiff, and in two years more to Caernarvon, where he contended with great difficulties from church debts and dissension. When on a collecting tour for that Church he died suddenly at Swansea, July 19th, 1838, in the seventy-second year of his age and the fifty-fourth of his wonderful ministry. As he passed from earth he said: 'I am leaving you; I have labored in the sanctuary fifty-three years, and this is my comfort, that I have never labored without blood in the basin!' With his last breath he referred to a verse in an old Welsh hymn, then waved his hand as if with Elijah in the chariot of fire, and cried: 'Wheel about, coachman; drive on!'

He had preached one hundred and sixty-three times before Baptist Associations and paid forty visits to South Wales, so that he held front rank in the Welsh ministry for more than

half a century without a stain on his moral character. In person he stood about six feet high, with an athletic frame – a very Anakim – and his head covered with thick, coarse, black hair. His bearing was dignified, notwithstanding an unwieldy gait, arising from an inequality of limbs, inducing an able writer to say that 'he appeared like one composed on the day after a great battle out of the scattered members of the slain;' or as a Yorkshire man expressed it to the writer, 'like a book taken in numbers, with some wanting.' His face betokened great intelligence and amiability, his eyebrows were dark and heavily arched and his one, large, dreamy eye was very brilliant. Robert Hall said of him that he was 'the tallest, stoutest, greatest man he ever saw; that he had but one eye, if it could be called an eye; it was more properly a brilliant star; it shined like Venus! and would light an army through a forest on a dark night.' This evangelical seraph of one eye, like all seraphs, had a warm and quick temperament, held under perfect control; and though his sustained power of imagination was astonishing, he was very dignified in debate. His piety was simple, modest and ardent. The writer thinks that one of the best tests of true power in a preacher is the character of his public prayers, and once asked an old and intelligent Welshman who had often heard Evans, to describe these. He replied: 'They were commonly short, but he seldom stopped until the tears rolled down his cheeks from his one eye and the empty socket of the other, while pleading for the special influences of the Holy Spirit that day.' Here was a secret of his eloquence which cannot be described more than the warm breathings of seraphim can be depicted. His voice had great compass and melody, his gestures were easy and forceful, and his composition crowded with metaphor and allegory. His style was more than original, it was unique, bearing the stamp of high genius,

as every sentence carried his own spirit and its expression to others in the nicest shadings of fervent thought. The press has given us two hundred of his sermons, which were methodical and strong in their unity. The Bible was as real to him as his own life, and hence, he drew the history and doctrine of the cross in true lines. He was more luminous in exposition, and fuller of imagery than Whitefield. His descriptions were pure inspirations of the imagination, and his sentences were the joint language of feeling and logic. After the ideal of Horace, men wept when he shed real tears. He breathed that vehement thought and passion into his speech which Longinus called 'a divine frenzy.' But his preaching was governed by a sense of obligation to God and the grandeur of love to man. These took his own soul by storm and stormed the souls of others. His one theme was Christ, his one aim to save guilty men, pulling them out of the fire, and so his pulpit power increased to the last. God put honor upon him, as he always has upon such men, 'and much people was added unto the Lord.'

JOHN JERKINS was another splendid specimen, of self-educated ministers in Wales. His parents were very lowly and he never spent a day in school. At the age of fourteen he found one of John Rhees's evening-school books and learned to read the Welsh Bible. The next year he was baptized at Llanwenarth, and became a pastor at the age of twenty-one on a salary of £3 per year. Thus humbling himself, in 1808 he was exalted to a salary of £16 per annum as pastor at Hengoed. There he built up one of the strongest Churches in the principality, and became a leading writer in the denomination. In 1811 he published a body of divinity under the title of the 'Silver Palace,' and followed it, in 1831, by a Commentary of the whole Bible. The Lewisburg University conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1852; and he died in Christ on June 5, 1853, aged seventy-

four years.

TIMOTHY THOMAS, of Aberduar, was a most robust, servant of Christ; the son of the 'Thunderer' of the same name. He was rough and ready, loved to ride the best horse in Wales, and made the whole country his parish. He celebrated his baptismal services in the open air, and would smite into the dust any disturber of his services, holding up his license in one hand and his Bible in the other, demanding 'order' by virtue of two warrants, one from the King of England and the other from the King of Heaven. When he was fourteen years of age his father died, but his father's mantle fell upon him. On returning from his funeral his mother mourned, saying, that the family altar had fallen and there was no one to build it up.' Timothy replied: 'Mother, it shall not fall;' and that night he conducted worship in the stricken home. After his ordination, in 1772-73, he went everywhere preaching the word. During his ministry he baptized about 2,000 converts, and with a touch of honest pride he loved to name amongst them Christmas Evans. He died in 1840, aged eighty-six years, protesting that there was nothing in his life worth recording for another generation.

JOHN WILLIAMS was the thorough scholar and translator of the New Testament into modern Welsh, he was born at Waen in 1806, and his youth was characterized by many eccentricities, one of which was that he constantly hid himself in the hedges and woods with his books, and at the age of twenty, without a master, had acquired a good knowledge of English and Latin, with considerable attainments in Greek, Hebrew and mathematics. At twenty-one he published an English grammar in Welsh and English, which brought him pressing invitations to enter the Episcopal ministry; but he was ordained a home missionary amongst the Baptists in 1834. He devoted himself, however, to the translation of

Chapter 11 - British Baptists – The Welsh Baptists

the New Testament and finished the task in four years. To reach the simple sense of the original by the best texts was his first aim, and his next, its faithful translation into his mother-tongue. Conviction obliged him to give an immersionist version, and while nobody pretended that his renderings were unfaithful, the cry was raised that he had made a 'Baptist Bible.' He expressed the act of baptism by the word *trochi*, which has no ecclesiastical meaning, and answers to dip, or immerse, in English, instead of retaining the word *bedydd*, which by ecclesiastical use has come to mean many things in Welsh, as the word *baptize* does in English. He suffered the greatest possible abuse, as if he were a God-fearing criminal. Wales produced few harder workers or more diligent inquirers after the truth. But the coarse abuse of men who could not understand how an honest scholar can hold himself responsible to God only deeply wounded his loyal soul. He was retiring, modest, unobtrusive, and his health sank under the cruel calumny of many of his own brethren. He died in 1856, at the age of but fifty years.

THOMAS REES DAVIES was a character, known amongst the irreverent as 'Old Black Cap,' because he wore a velvet cap in the pulpit. For years he stood second to Christmas Evans in popularity. He itinerated, and so great was his work that he said there were few rivers, brooks, or tanks in Wales in which he had not baptized. His wife being wealthy, he sustained himself. Some disagreement with the Baptists led to his expulsion in 1818, and he spent about seven years amongst the Wesleyans, with whom he was very useful: but he delighted in telling them that he was 'a Baptist dyed in the wool.' At one of their great missionary meetings he said: 'The Baptists think much of themselves, but they cannot do all the work in the world. We Wesleyans must be in the field, too; but as to that, we shall all be Baptists in the end.' When he returned to the Baptists he said

to his Methodist brethren: 'Good-bye, I am going home.' He was welcomed back and labored successfully. During forty-seven years he preached 13,145 sermons, averaging above five a week and left a minute record of the time, place and text of each sermon. He preached the same sermon over and over again for twenty times, and the people were newly delighted each time, and each discourse came to be known by some peculiar name. His sermons were so natural that they seemed to have been born with him, and he said they would 'always go, because he kept them in a safe place.' They were quaint productions and antithetic, but clear and-pointed. Then he flavored them with homely mother-wit and delivered them in an easy oratory, which made them impressive, despite a slight impediment in his speech, so that there was a great mystery about his eloquence. He best describes himself when about visiting London. Writing to a deacon there, who did not know him, but was to meet him, he says:

'At Euston Station, December 3d, 1847, and about nine o'clock in the evening, expect the arrival by train of a gray-headed old man; very tall, like the ancient Britons, and without an outward blemish, like a Jewish high-priest. Like Elijah, he will wear a blue mantle, not shaggy, but superfine, and like Jacob, he will have a staff in his hand, but will not be lame, it is hoped. But most especially, he will have a white string to his hat, fastened to his coat button. There will be many there with black strings, but his will be white. Let the friend ask, "Are you Davies?" and his answer will be, "Yes."'

He started on a preaching tour through South Wales in 1859, but told his friends that he was going there to die, and to be buried in the same grave with Christmas Evans. On the 22d of July he preached his last sermon at Morristown, near Swansea, when he was taken sick. He said: 'I am very ill. Let me die in the

bed where Christmas Evans died.' That was impracticable. But on the following Sunday he fell asleep, and was buried in Evans's grave!

ROBERT ELLIS was a prodigy, after his order. Although nine months' training under John Williams was all the schooling that he ever had, he excelled as an antiquarian, hard, lecturer, preacher and biblical interpreter. He came to be regarded as an authority in almost every branch of Welsh literature, and was one of the most idiomatic Welsh writers of his day. He was the author of many poems, and of 'Five Lectures on Baptism,' but his greatest work was his 'Commentary of the New Testament,' in three volumes. Born, 1812; died, 1875.

WILLIAM MORGAN, D.D., one of the ablest ministers of North Wales, devoted his life to the interests of the Baptists at Holyhead, from the year 1825. He was the first biographer of Christmas Evans, and published three volumes of sermons. The Georgetown College, Kentucky, honored him with the title of D.D. After a very useful ministry, he died in 1873.

JOHN EMLYN JONES, M.A., LL.D., was born in 1820. He was pastor of Baptist Churches at Nebo, Cardiff, Merthyr, Tydvil and Llandudno. He was a very eloquent preacher, and distinguished himself as an author in works of theology, history and general literature; also as the translator of Gill's Commentary into Welsh. He was a poet of eminence, attaining the honor of Chair-Bard, B.B.D., by winning a chair at Denbigh, and another at Llanerchymedd. He prepared a Topographical Dictionary of the whole world, but left it incomplete. He died in 1873. His Doctor's degree was conferred by the University of Glasgow.

HUGH JONES, D.D., was born at Anglesea, July 10th, 1831. His parents possessed unusual talents, especially his mother. He was baptized at Llanfachreth by Rev. R.D. Roberts at the age of fourteen, and

preached his first sermon in what the Welsh call 'Gyfeillach,' the weekly experience meeting, which is greatly prized in their Churches. His first public discourse was preached in 1851, and he entered the college at Haverfordwest in 1853. There he remained for four years, and became proficient in mathematics, the classics and Hebrew. He wished to enter the foreign mission work, but was prevented by ill health. In 1857 he became associate pastor to Mr. Griffiths at Llandudno, and remained there for two years, when he took the same service for Dr. Pritchard at Llangollen. The Baptist College was established there in 1862, and these co-pastors were appointed co-tutors, Mr. Jones being classical tutor. Dr. Pritchard resigned his connection both with the Church and the College in 1866, and Mr. Jones became principal of the College, resigning his pastoral relation. Under his labors the institution attained great prosperity, but he overworked himself, and in 1877 was obliged to seek relief and health on the Continent, where he appeared to improve and returned to his post. In 1883 his health suddenly failed again, and on the 28th of May he was unexpectedly called to his reward above. He left a widow and eleven children to mourn their loss, and in about two years his children became full orphans, for their mother died and was buried in the same grave with their father. In every respect Dr. Jones was a man of rare mark. His intellect was keen, his will strong, his heart large and his application close. His pure character and quiet courage, his simple habits and genial manliness, endeared him to all who knew him, and he has left a deep impression on the Baptist interests of the principality. His thorough consecration to Christ and profound biblical scholarship are abundantly seen in his works, 'The Bible and its Interpretation,' and the 'Act of Baptism.'

These sketches of Welsh Baptists might be continued at great length, but a long list of

Chapter 11 - British Baptists – The Welsh Baptists

illustrious names must be passed in silence, as well as all that relates to the influence of Welsh Baptists in other parts of Great Britain, for their laymen and ministers have filled the highest posts of influence and usefulness in all parts of the United Kingdom. The above are sufficient to show the strong elements which our principles have developed in Welsh character. They bring out its vigor of intellect, its heroic courage, its high moral sentiment, its glow of holy feeling and its benevolent zeal. When we take into account the soft and liquid flow of the Welsh language, the patriotism of the Welsh people, their devotion to civil and religious liberty, and their enthusiastic religious emotion, we are not astonished at their success; nor can we wonder at the great molding influence which they have exerted upon the Baptist Churches of the New World.

The statistics of the United Kingdom, including the Channel Islands, shows 2,713 churches, 315,939 members, with 1,893 pastors.

The Baptist Churches in Wales were never in a more prosperous condition than at the present time. They not only stand firmly by the truth, but year by year they are resisting that anomaly of the nineteenth century, the incubus of a State Church. Since the disestablishment

and disendowment of the Irish Church the Welsh people feel more and more the galling yoke, and are attempting to shake it off with greater spirit. Recently, not only the Baptists, but the Independents and Calvinistic Methodists have arisen with almost one accord to resist the enforcement of tithes in behalf of the Established Church. The 'tithe-war' as it is called, broke out recently in the parish of Llanarmon, and distraint upon the goods of the farmers there has aroused the resistance of all Non-conformists. It is strange that this blot upon Christianity should have remained unwiped out so long, but this relic of barbarism must soon disappear in Wales. At this moment the auctioneer is selling confiscated property in all directions, and every fall of his hammer drives a new nail into the coffin of the politico-ecclesiastical State Church, but not before its time to fall. In 1868 compulsory church rates were abolished, 1880 the Burial Act was passed, relieving Dissenters from abominable annoyances in burying their dead, and it is not meet that the twentieth century should be disgraced by one vestige of Welsh oppression in this direction. It is strange that the Welsh have endured this yoke so long, and the sooner they rise in their strength and shake it off the better.

THE AMERICAN BAPTISTS

Chapter 1 - The Colonial Period – Pilgrims and Puritans

The passage of the *Mayflower* over the Atlantic was long and rough. Often before its bosom had been torn by keels seeking the golden fleece for kings, but now the kings themselves were on board this frail craft, bringing the golden fleece with them; and the old deep had all that she could do to bear this load of royalty safely over. Stern as she was, the men borne on her waves were sterner. More than a new empire was intrusted to her care, a new freedom. 'What ailed thee, O sea?' When this historic ship came to her moorings, not unlike the vessel tossed on Galilee, she was freighted with principles, convictions, institutions and laws. These should first govern a quarter of the globe here, and then go back to the Old World to effect its regeneration and shape its Future. The Pilgrims knew not that the King of all men was so signally with them in the bark, and would send them forth as the fishers of Gennesaret were sent, on an errand of revolution. In intellect, conscience and true soul-greatness, these quiet founders of a new nation were highly gifted, so that song and story will send their names down to the end of time on the bead-roll of fame. The monarchs of the earth have already raised their crowns in reverence to their greatness, and they are canonized in the moral forces which impelled and followed them.

Imperial bombast in James I had chuckled over this band of strong-souled ones. He 'had peppered them soundly,' as he loved to boast, and 'harried them' out of his land in the bitterness of their grief; but when their sturdy feet pressed Plymouth Rock they had a conscience void of offense toward Holland, England and God. An invisible hand had guided the helm of the *Mayflower* to a rock from which, in a wintry storm, a group of simple-

hearted heroes, with bare heads, could proclaim a Church without a bishop and a State without a king. Next to their adoration of the Lord of Hosts, their great religious thought at that moment was English Separatism. This thought had bearings in embryo upon the future births of time, in the genesis of such truths as only mature in the throes of ages. The founders of Plymouth were not Puritans, or Non-conformists, but Separatists, who had paid a great price for their freedom, and had come from an independent congregation in Leyden. Their great germinal idea was deep-seated, for their love of liberty had been nourished with the blood of a suffering brotherhood. They ranked with the most advanced thinkers and lovers of the radical principles of their age, and yet, though they were honestly feeling their way to those principles in all their primal simplicity, they had not already attained to their full use. They intended to be as honest and as honorable as the skies above them. History has laid the charge of rigid sternness at their door, but they evidently established their new colony in love to God and man.

Fuller, Collier, and several other old writers show that the Brownists, from whom they sprang, caught their idea of absolute Church independency from the Dutch Baptists. Weingarten makes this strong statement:

"The perfect agreement between the views of Brown and those of the Baptists as far as the nature of a Church is concerned, is certainly proof enough that he borrowed this idea from them; though in his "True Declaration" of 1584 he did not deem it advisable to acknowledge the fact, lest he should receive in addition to all the opprobrious names heaped upon him, that of Anabaptist. In 1571 there were no less than 3,925 Dutchmen in Norwich.' Also Scheffer says: 'That Brown's

The American Baptists

new ideas concerning the nature of the Church opened to him in the circle of the Dutch Baptists in Norwich. Brandt, in his "Reformation in the Low Countries," shows that when Brown's Church was dissolved by dissensions at Middleburg, in the Netherlands, where the Baptists were very numerous, some of his people fell in with the Baptists.' And Johnson, pastor of the Separatist Church at Amsterdam, wrote, in 1606 that 'divers' of that Church who had been driven from England 'fell into the errors of the Anabaptists, which were too common in those countries.'

Bishop Sanderson wrote, in 1681, that Whitgift and Hooker did 'long foresee and declare their fear that if Puritanism should prevail amongst us, it would soon draw in Anabaptism after it. These good men judged right; they only considered, as prudent men, that Anabaptism had its rise from the same principles the Puritans held, and its growth from the same courses they took, together with the natural tendency of their principles and practices toward it.' He then says that if the ground be taken that the Scriptures are the only rule so as 'nothing might lawfully be done without express warrant, either from some command or example therein contained, the clew thereof, if followed as far as it would lead, would certainly in time carry them as far as the Anabaptists were then gone.'

This clear-minded prelate perfectly understood the logical and legitimate result of Baptist principles, and this result the Plymouth men had readied on the question of Church independency, but they were still learners on the question of full liberty of conscience aside from the will of magistrates.

The permanent landing of the pilgrims at Plymouth began Dec. 20th, 1620 (O.S.), but on the 11th of November they had entered into a solemn 'compact,' thus:

'Having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia; do by these presents, solemnly and

mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and officers, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.'

For about a month after founding the settlement their government took something of the patriarchal form, with the governor, John Carver, as the head of the family. Soon seven assistants were given to him, who in time became his council. In 1623 trial by jury was established in case of trespass between man and man, and of crime. Then laws were passed fixing the age of freemen at twenty-one years, provided, that they were sober, peaceful and orthodox in religion. To secure the last, membership in the Church was made a test of citizenship, and so they fell into the blunder of making their civil and ecclesiastical polity one, a strange combination of iron and clay, intended to be inexorable after the pattern of the ancient Hebrew Commonwealth, although that exact form of government had perished two thousand years before, and long before the Church of Christ with its spiritual laws existed.

They themselves had first tasted the sweets of civil and religious liberty in the Netherlands, under the advanced Christian idea of government for man as such. They had availed themselves of that liberty which Christian patriots, and amongst them the Dutch Baptists, had suffered so much to purchase; and yet they had failed to learn the primary lesson of full liberty of conscience in civil government, as the first right of each man in the State. Their mistake was inexcusable on the popular plea that this idea was in advance of their age. But for that idea and its practical use they would not

have founded Plymouth; for without its shield they could not have found an asylum in Holland, when they were driven from their own home in England. Their liberty in Holland, while; in fact, the greatest possible reality to them, was treated in Plymouth as a mere impractical ideal, when they came to found a 'civil body politic' of their own. And this is rendered the more remarkable from the fact, that they were placed under no chartered religious restriction themselves. When they applied to England for a charter in 1618, Sir John Worsingham asked: 'Who shall make your ministers?' Their representative ('S.B.') answered: 'The power of making [them] was in the Church, to be ordained by the imposition of hands, by the fittest instruments they have; it must be either in the Church or from the pope; and the pope is Anti-christ.' That point was waived, therefore, and Felt says that S.B. 'asked his worship what good news he had for me to write tomorrow' (to Robinson and Brewster). 'He told me good news, for both the king's majesty and the bishops have consented.' The patent which was given them was taken in the name of John Wincob, a Christian gentleman who intended to accompany them, but who failed to do so, hence they could not legally avail themselves of its benefits, and really came without a patent. The petulance of the king would give them none, and they left without his authority, saying: 'If there is a settled purpose to do us wrong, it is easy to break a seal, though it be as broad as a house floor.' Felt says again: 'The Pilgrims are aware that their invalid patent does not privilege them to be located so far north, and grants them "only the general leave of his majesty for the free exercise of the liberty of conscience in the public worship of God."' In any case, therefore, with the patent or without it, they were left untrammelled in the exercise of their liberty of conscience, both as it 'regards the form of religion which any citizen might

choose, and his right to citizenship without any order of religion, after the Holland pattern. Under their own 'compact' then, they first formed a 'civil body politic,' and then a Church, the colony to be jointly governed by the officers of both. In some aspects of this union the State was rather absorbed into the Church than united to it, but the elders and magistrates were so united that together they enforced the duties both of the first and second tables of the Ten Commandments. The elders did not always consult the civil functionary in Church matters, but the civil functionary did not act in important public affairs without consulting the elders.

The Puritans, who settled the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1628, eight years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, were another people entirely. They had paid a less price for their religious freedom and were less tolerant in spirit; while in regard to the separation of the Church from the State they stood substantially with the Pilgrims. The Plymouth men had separated from the Church of England as a corrupt and fallen body, but the Puritans continued in communion with that Church, although they refused to conform to many of its practices and denounced them warmly; and hence were known as Non-conformists or Puritans. They believed firmly in the union of the Church and State as a political necessity, while the Pilgrims believed in it as a spiritual necessity, and in turn they were denounced by the Puritans as 'schismatics.' While the men of Massachusetts Bay were on shipboard, they sent an address to their friends in England calling the Established Church there their 'dear mother,' from whose bosom they had 'sucked' the hope of salvation. When the Atlantic stretched between them, however, they organized Congregational Churches and established them by law, limiting political suffrage to membership therein, obliging all citizens to pay for their support, coercing all

into conformity therewith, forbidding all dissenting Churches, and enforcing these prohibitions and requirements by penalties of disfranchisement, fine, imprisonment, scourging and banishment, the same as in cases of civil crime. All is substantially summed up in this decree, passed May 18, 1631, by the general court: 'No man shall be admitted to the body politic but such as are members of some of the Churches within the limits of the same,' that is, the Colony.

The Puritans having equal aversion to the Separatists of Leyden and to the assumptions of the Church of England, they aimed at working out a third way; but when they came to put their theory into practice the logic of events brought them to substantially the Plymouth position, and as the two colonies came to know each other, their prejudices and misunderstandings almost vanished. The agreement, however, between the men of the 'Bay' and those of 'Plymouth' concerning the constitution and polity of a Church was never perfect. The Plymouth Church order, at first, contained a trace of aristocracy in the ruling eldership, but this only continued during the lives of three men: Brewster, chosen in 1609; Cushman, in 1649; and Faunce, 1657. After that the vital hold of the eldership was broken, the constant tendency being toward a pure democracy, giving to every member an equal voice. The 'Bay' Churches, on the contrary, gravitated toward what was called Barrowism, which placed Church power in the hands of the elders. But in 1648 the Cambridge platform gave the elders 'the power of office,' defined to be the right of ruling and directing the Church. After that the eldership became the ruling power in the Churches of New England, although this aristocratic tendency was less hearty in the Plymouth colony. The leaders in the Churches generally were from the higher walks of life, and were not prepared to admit the principle of

a pure democracy in Church or State. They stood with Milton, Locke and Lightfoot in intelligence and literature, with Cromwell, Hampden and Pym in statesmanship. It is computed that the 21,000 persons who came into New England between 1630-40 brought with them £500,000 – £2,500,000, which, reckoning money as worth then six times more than it is today, they brought property to the value of £15,000,000, and with this all the conservatism which wealth implied in those days. The most of this money was brought by the Puritans, as the Pilgrims were very poor. So long as the 'body politic' was one with the Church, their joint polity must be more rigorous and concentrated than the democratic form allowed, and so in a very short time proscription, bigotry and intolerance asserted themselves bravely. Bishop Peck, an admirer of the Puritans, who is ready to excuse their faults whenever he can, is compelled to say: 'It is both curious and lamentable to see the extreme spirit of Protestantism reaching the very proscriptive bigotry of Romanism, and the brave assertion of Puritan rights resulting in the bitter persecuting tolerance of prelacy; and yet historical fidelity compels the admission. We must confess, however reluctantly, that the spirit of proscription and intolerance in New England is exactly identical with the same spirit which we found in Virginia.'

Still it is a pure mockery of historical truth, and an unjust reflection upon the Puritans themselves, to put in the special plea of modern discovery that the Massachusetts Bay Company was a mere business company, a body of 'mercenary adventurers,' as their worst enemies loved to brand them. The charter which they first received of James, and which Charles enlarged, made them a 'body politic,' so far as a colony could be, under which they both asserted and exercised the right of self-government in home affairs for more than half

Chapter 1 - The Colonial Period – Pilgrims and Puritans

a century. Their charter endowed them with power to make laws, to choose civil officers, to administer allegiance to new citizens, to exact oaths, to support military officers from the public treasury, and to make defensive war, all independent of the crown. Nay, they made some offences capital, which were not capital in England. So thoroughly did they understand these rights and determine to defend them, that in 1634, when England appointed the archbishops and ten members of the Privy Council, with power to call in all patents of the plantations, to make laws, raise tithes for ministers, to remove governors, and inflict punishment even to death, Massachusetts Bay flew to arms, and rightly; too, as a Commonwealth, and not as a business corporation. All the pastors were convened with the civil officers of the colony to answer the question: 'What we ought to do if a general governor shall be sent out of England?' Their unanimous answer was: 'We ought not to accept him, but defend our lawful possessions, if we are able; otherwise to avoid or protract.' And with the spirit, not of traders and mercenaries, but of patriots, they begun to collect arms and ammunition, to drill and discipline their men, and to fortify Castle Island, Charlestown and Dorchester Heights. The General Court forbade the circulation of farthings, made bullets a legal tender for a farthing each, appointed a military commission, established a strict military discipline, and erected a beacon on 'Beacon Hill,' to alarm the country in case of English invasion. More than this, the Military Commission was empowered 'to do whatever may be further behooveful for the good of this plantation, in case of any war that may befall us.' They also required every male resident of sixteen years and over to take the 'Freeman's Oath,' and intrusted the Commission with the power of the death penalty.

A facetious writer may be allowed to say

that the Puritans came to this country 'to worship God according to their own consciences, and to prevent other people from worshipping him according to theirs,' and we can pardon his playful way of putting this matter. But it is unpardonable in a grave historian to impose upon his readers, by belittling these grand men, and underrating their virtues by ranking them with those who came here in search of religious liberty for themselves alone. To say that they looked upon their charter only as the title-deed of a grasping community holding their possessions by right of fee simple rather than as their only country which they had sworn to protect, is to do them the grossest wrong. They came for another purpose, of the highest and holiest order that liberty and the love of God could inspire. They sought this land not only as an asylum where they could be free themselves, but as a home for the oppressed who were strangers to them, else why did they enfranchise all refugees who took the oath and make them freemen, too? According to Felt, Styles, and many others, they founded a Christian 'State.' President Styles well said, in 1783: 'It is certain that civil dominion was but the second motive, religion the primary one, with our ancestors in coming hither and settling this land. It was not so much their design to establish religion for the benefit of the State, as civil government for the benefit of religion, and as subservient, and even necessary, for the peaceable enjoyment and unmolested exercise of religion – of that religion for which they fled to these ends of the earth.' Their charter under Charles left them on the basis pointed out by Matthew Cradock, governor of the company; July 28th, 1629, namely, with 'the transfer of the government of the plantation to those who shall inhabit there,' as well as with liberty of conscience, so that they could be as liberal as they pleased in religious matters. They neither were nor could

The American Baptists

be chartered as a purely civil nor as a purely spiritual body, but all that related to the rights of man, body and soul, was claimed and enjoyed by them under their charter.

John Cotton understood that the colony possessed all the rights of a 'body politic,' with its attendant responsibilities. In his reply to Williams, he says:

'By the patent certain select men, as magistrates and freemen, have power to make laws, and the magistrates to execute justice and judgment amongst the people according to such laws. By the patent we have power to erect such a government of the Church as is most agreeable to the word, to the estate of the people, and to the gaining of natives, in God's time, first to civility, and then to Christianity. To this authority established by this patent. Englishmen do readily submit themselves; and foreign plantations, the French, the Dutch, the Swedish, do willingly transact their negotiations with us, as with a colony established by the royal authority of the State of England.'

No fault, therefore, is to be found with the Massachusetts Bay authorities for the punishment of civil and political offenders, even with banishment and death, as in the case of Frost, who was banished for crime in 1632, under the sentence: 'He shall be put to death,' if he returned. In 1633 the same thing was repeated in the case of Stone, this Commonwealth assuming the highest prerogative that any civil power can claim, that over life and death. Twenty distinct cases of banishment from the colony are on record within the first seven years of its settlement, fourteen of them occurring within the first year.

Their wrong lay not in these and similar acts for criminal and political causes, but in that they punished men for religious opinions and practices; under the plea, that to hold and express such opinions was a political offense by their laws, although the charter made no such

demand of them; but permitted them, had they chosen, to extend equal religious rights to all the Christian colonists, with those which they exercised themselves. The simple fact is, that they wielded the old justification of persecution used by all persecutors from the days of Jesus down: 'We have a law, and by our law he ought to die,' without once stopping to ask by what right we have such a law. With all their high aims and personal goodness, they repeated the old blunder of law-makers, that those who were not one with them in religious faith should not exercise the rights of men in the body politic, because they must be and were its enemies. There can be but little doubt that with all their high aspirations after civil and religious liberty, the late Dr. Geo. E. Ellis, of Boston, stated then case with what Dr. Dexter pronounces 'admirable accuracy,' thus:

'To assume, as some carelessly do, that when Roger Williams and others asserted the right and safety of liberty of conscience, they announced a novelty that was alarming, because it was a novelty, to the authorities of Massachusetts, is a great error. Our fathers were fully informed as to what it was, what it meant; and they were familiar with such results as it wrought in their day. They knew it well, and what must come of it; and they did not like it; rather they feared and hated it. They did not mean to live where it was indulged; and in the full exercise of their intelligence and prudence, they resolved not to tolerate it among them. They identified freedom of conscience only with the objectionable and mischievous results which came of it. They might have met all around them in England, in city and country, all sorts of wild, crude, extravagant and fanatical spirits. They had reason to fear that many whimsical and factious persons would come over hither, expecting to find an unsettled state of things, in which they would have the freest range for their eccentricities. They were prepared to stand on the defensive.'

This frank and manly statement of the case

Chapter 1 - The Colonial Period – Pilgrims and Puritans

is truly historical, because it tells the exact truth; although, perhaps, it never occurred to the men of the Bay, that Elizabeth and James had ranked them and their Plymouth brethren with the 'wild, crude, extravagant and fanatical spirits' of their realm. Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, had boasted that he would drive every Lollard out of his diocese, or 'Make them hop headless, or fry a fagot;' and what better had the Puritans been treated in English 'city and country?' The barbarous cruelties which had failed to reduce their consciences to submission should have suggested to them at least, as incurables themselves, that it might not be their special and bounden duty as magistrates, to crush out all eccentric religionists who happened to be 'crude,' 'extravagant' and 'fanatical,' as enemies of good civil government. Whether they were justified in so treating those who asserted the right and safety of liberty of conscience, is hardly an open question now. So far as appears, the first resistance made to the politico-religious law of the colony came from two brothers, John and Samuel Brown, members of the Church of England. In 1629 they set up worship in Salem according to the book of Common Prayer, alleging that the governor and ministers were already 'Separatists, and would be Anabaptists.' Upon the complaint of the ministers and by the authority of the governor they were sent back to England. Endicott says that their conduct in the

matter engendered faction and mutiny. The ministers declared that they had 'come away from the Common Prayer and ceremonies,' and 'neither could nor would use them, because they judged the imposition of these things to be sinful corruptions in the worship of God.' The first false step of the Puritans of the Bay compelled them to take the second or retreat; but they now proceeded to narrow all admittance into the Commonwealth by the test of religious belief, a step which opened a struggle for liberty of conscience, lasting for more than two hundred years in Massachusetts.

This statement of the civil and religious status of the two colonies of Plymouth and the Bay seems necessary to a proper understanding of the state of things under which Roger Williams, the great apostle of religious liberty, opened the contest, which compelled these great and good men to take that last step, which now protects every man's conscience in America. The chosen teacher who was to show these two bands 'the way of the Lord more perfectly,' as usual, at the cost of great suffering, was now brought unexpectedly to their doors. The old record says:

'The ship Lyon, Mr. William Pierce master, arrived at Nantasket; she brought Mr. Williams, a godly minister, with his wife, Mr. Throgmorton, and others with their wives and children, about twenty passengers, and about two hundred tons of goods.'

The American Baptists

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

The first Baptist of America, like the first of Asia, was the herald of a new reign; hence it was fitting that he should have a wilderness education, should increase for a time and then decrease, that the truth might be glorified. Roger Williams, according to the general belief, was born of Welsh parentage about the year 1600. While young he went to London and, by his skill in reporting, attracted the attention of Sir Edward Coke, the great lawyer who framed the Bill of Rights and defended the Commons in their contest with the crown. By his advice and patronage Williams entered the famous 'Charter House School,' and afterward the University at Cambridge, where Coke himself had been educated, and which was decidedly Puritan in its tone. He was matriculated a pensioner of Pembroke College July 7th, 1625, and took his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1627. For a time he is supposed to have studied law, and this legal training undoubtedly prepared him for his after legislative career. His bent, however, was toward theology, and he finally took orders in the Church of England, together with a parish, probably in Lincolnshire, under the liberal John Williams, afterward Archbishop of York.

Roger was a stern Puritan, opposed to the liturgy and hierarchy as Laud represented them, and being acquainted with John Cotton and other emigrants to America, he determined to make his home in Massachusetts. He left Bristol December 1st, 1630, and reached Boston February 5th, 1631. His ample fortune, learning and godly character commended him, and he was invited to become teacher in the church there, under the pastoral care of John Wilson. He was a sturdy Puritan when he left England, but when he reached Boston he had become a Separatist, and declared openly that he would not unite with the Church there, as he 'durst not officiate to an unseparated people.'

The Puritans held the Church of England to be corrupt in its government, ceremonies and persecuting spirit, and having discarded episcopacy and the ritual, had formed Congregational churches in Massachusetts, and therefore he thought that they should not hold fellowship with that Church. After a great struggle he had cut loose from that Church, and says: 'Truly it was as bitter as death to me when Bishop Laud pursued me out of this land, and my conscience was persuaded against the national Church.' He denounced that Church in strong language, but not a whit stronger than every Puritan had used, and this would have given no offense had he rested there. But he administered sharp rebuke of their inconsistency in stopping short of full separation. Others shared his views in this respect, and denounced them as 'semi-Separatists,' insisting that as the principal end of the new plantation was to enjoy a pure religion, the separation should be complete. When Williams found in his refuge a semi-fellowship with the English Church and the Congregational Churches put under the control of the magistrates, he foresaw at a glance, that corruption and persecution must work out in America the same results that they had wrought in England. At once, therefore, he protested, as a sound-minded man, that the magistrate might not punish a breach of the first table of the law, comprised in the first four of the Ten Commandments.

This was the rebuke that stung the authorities of Massachusetts Bay, and from that moment he had little rest until his banishment. In April, 1631, he was invited to become teacher to the Church at Salem, the eldest Church in the colony, organized August 6, 1629. At once, six members of the court in Boston wrote to Endicott at Salem, warning the Salem people against him as a dangerous man,

for broaching the foregoing novel opinions, and asking the Church there to confer with the Boston Council in regard to his case. Upham, who wrote the history of this Church, reports that it was organized 'On principles of perfect and entire independence of every other ecclesiastical body.' Hence, it acted independently of this advice from Boston and received Williams as its minister on the 12th of April. Felt says: 'Here we have an indication that the Salem Church, by calling Williams, coincided with his opinions, just specified, and thus differed with the Church in Boston.' This fact accounts for the long struggle between the Salem Church and the colonial government in relation to Williams. That Church and the Church at Plymouth refused communion with members of the Church of England. The first ministers of the Salem Church were Skelton as pastor and Higginson as teacher. Higginson drew up its Articles of Faith, which Hubbard pronounces 'a little discrepant from theirs of Plymouth,' yet not so different but that Governor Bradford, the Separatist 'delegate' from Plymouth, gave the hand of fellowship when the Salem Church was recognized. For a considerable time the other Churches of the Bay looked askance at the Salem Church. Winthrop arrived at Salem from England, in the Arbella, on Saturday, June 12th, 1630, where he and others went ashore, but returned to the ship for Sunday, because, as Cotton says, Skelton could not 'Conscientiously admit them to his communion, nor allow any of their children to be baptized. The reason of such scruple is, that they are not members of the Reformed Churches, like those of Salem and Plymouth.'

This treatment of Winthrop drew forth a severe letter from Cotton to Skelton, dated October 2d, 1630, in which he says that he is 'not a little troubled' 'That you should deny the Lord's Supper to such godly and faithful servants of Christ as Mr. Governor, Mr.

Johnson, Mr. Dudley, and Mr. Coddington...My grief increased upon me when I heard you denied baptism to Mr. Coddington's child, and that upon a reason worse than the fact, 'namely, that he was not a member of one of the Reformed Churches. He then argues that both Skelton and John Robinson were wrong in taking such ground. Robinson and Brewster had taken this position in their letter to Sir John Worsingham, January 27th, 1618: 'We do administer baptism only to such infants as whereof the one parent at the least is of some Church.' Coddington was a member of a National Church, and not one of 'saints by calling,' as Robinson's in Leyden and Skelton's in Salem; and therefore, the latter would neither christen his child nor allow him at communion. Truly had Robinson said: 'The Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word,' which light was beginning to gleam in Salem. These facts greatly assist us in understanding the animus of resistance to Williams at every step, and why Morton says that in one year's time he had filled Salem 'with principles of rigid separation, and tending to Anabaptistry.' The soil had been prepared to his hands under the ministry of Skelton and Higginson, who despite themselves had drifted to the verge of Baptist principles without intending to be Baptists.

Williams was not permitted an undisturbed life at Salem, although his services were greatly blessed in that community. The Massachusetts Court could not forget its unheeded advice to that Church, and he had no rest. In his magnanimity, rather than contend with them, he withdrew at the end of the summer to Plymouth, beyond the jurisdiction of the Bay Company, where he found warm friends, and employed his high attainments in assisting Ralph Smith, pastor of the Mayflower Church. The Bay men spared no efforts to make the Plymouth Church restless under its new

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

teacher, and even kindhearted Brewster, the ruling elder of that Church, became set against him, stern Separatist as he was and had been from Scrooby down. He saw something in Roger which reminded him of John Smyth. 'Anabaptistry' had always acted on the good old elder's nerves like a red flag on the masculine head amongst cattle, and Williams's principles raised his honest fear that Roger would actually 'Run the same course of rigid separation and ana-baptistry which Mr. John Smyth, the Se-Baptist at Amsterdam, had done.' At this time Skelton's health failed, in August, 1634, he died, and Williams was called back to Salem, first as supply then as his successor. He returned, accompanied by members of the Plymouth Church, who could not forego the 'more light' which was breaking in upon them through his ministry. He was made a great blessing to the Church, but outsiders could not let him alone, and their constant interference tried his patience to the uttermost. Upham says: 'He was faithfully and resolutely protected by the people of Salem, through years of persecution from without, and it was only by the persevering and combined efforts of all the other towns and Churches that his separation and banishment were finally effected.'

In December, 1633, the General Court convened to consult upon a treatise of his, in which he disputed the right of the colonies to their lands under their patent. This work is not extant, and we can only judge of it from the account given by Winthrop and Cotton, aided by his own statement that he had a troubled conscience that 'Christian kings (so-called) are invested with a right by virtue of their Christianity to take and give away the lands and countries of other men.' Winthrop himself says, that when the treatise was examined, it was found to be 'written in very obscure and implicative phrases,' of uncertain interpretation. It seems to have been a mere theoretical

speculation, was submitted to the Court at Winthrop's request, in manuscript and unpublished; and it was agreed to pass over his offense on retraction, or taking an oath of allegiance to the king. The practical importance which Williams attached to it is seen in the fact, that he offered to burn the treatise, and that he wrote the Court 'submissively' and 'penitently.' They took his offer to burn his manuscript as the abandonment of his honest principles; with him it had done its work. So, this terrible affair in which James I was charged with public blasphemy and falsehood, and that other delectable character, Charles I, was likened to the 'frogs' and 'dragon' of Revelations, came to an end and still Massachusetts lived. After this, he was cited to appear before the Court on three different occasions, once to account for further remarks made in a sermon in regard to the patent, once to answer for his opposition to the Freeman's Oath, and finally, to meet the charges on which he was banished in October, 1635. The following is his sentence:

'Whereas Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the Church of Salem, hath broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions, against the authority of magistrates, as also writ letters of defamation, both of the magistrates and Churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without retraction, it is therefore ordered, that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction, not to return any more without license of the Court.'

A clear view of the case may be gathered from the specifications as summed up before the Court by the governor, who said: 'Mr. Williams holds forth these four particulars: 1st. That we have not our land by patent from the king, but that the natives are the true owners of it, and that we ought to repent of such a receiving it by patent, 2d. That it is not

lawful to call a wicked person to swear, to pray, as being actions of God's worship, 3d. That it is not lawful to hear any of the ministers of the parish assemblies in England, 4th. That the civil magistrate's power extends only to the bodies and goods, and outward state of men, etc.' In his letter to Endicott, Williams explains the bearings of the 4th point in the governor's summing, in these words: 'The point is that of the civil magistrate's dealing in matters of conscience and religion, as also of persecuting and hunting any for any matter merely spiritual and religious.'

As partisanship has greatly distorted this historical event, it is needful to examine it carefully and somewhat at length, with due regard to the exact facts: 1st. Touching the then existing form of government.; 2d. The records of the case; and, 3d. The representations of the several parties who were concerned in the decision. Viewed within these limits, it is folly to claim that either the authorities or Williams can be justified in all that they did. One extreme position assumes that Massachusetts Bay was purely a business corporation, and so its Court might exercise as arbitrary a power of expulsion as that of a commercial association; which interpretation in view of the legislative, executive and judicial prerogatives, exercised by the colony, is a very flimsy absurdity. It is especially so in view of the warlike preparations of the colony for rebellion against English power, and the setting up of an independent sovereignty if necessary. On the other hand, this primitive government was necessarily crude, and did many things which were summary and arbitrary, as judged by present standards. Its acts were frequently directed to accomplish particular objects then in view, as political necessities, without much regard to the general and primary principles of law.

As to Williams himself: It is clear that he was carefully feeling his way to the stand which he took so grandly in after life, our modern

conception of the proper relation of Church and State; namely, that each is absolute in its own sphere and without mutual interference. It is quite as clear also, that during his Salem troubles he had not yet arrived at this full conception. While under citation to appear before the General Court, to answer charges which it deemed heretical, the Salem people petitioned that Court to grant and assign to them certain lands on Marblehead Neck, which petition was refused. This was a purely civil matter, which the Court only could control. But Williams made a Church matter of it, and availing himself of what was known amongst the Churches as the 'Way of Admonition,' induced his Church to send a general letter to the other Churches of which the magistrates who had refused the Salem petition were members, asking them to 'admonish' these magistrates, and 'require them to grant without delay such petitions, or else to proceed against them in a Church way;' or as Cotton expresses it: 'That they might admonish the magistrates of scandalous injustice of denying this petition.' If this account can be relied upon, as the letter itself does not seem to be in existence, then the spiritual power of the Salem Church was used to influence the magistrates to do a political act. Probably, this is the letter of 'defamation' of magistrates referred to in his sentence.

In the matter of the test oath blame lodges against Williams, but this is not so clear as in the matter of the Salem petition. The General Court had ordered that each man above twenty-one years of age, who resided in the colony, should take the Resident's Oath of obedience to the laws, to promote the peace and welfare of the colony, and to reveal all plots against it coming to their knowledge. This was a fair and wise requirement, provided, that it contravened no previous legal act or right of the citizen. In May, 1634, the General Assembly, meeting in Boston, revoked the former oath of a freeman,

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

which required his obedience to laws that should be made 'lawfully,' and substituted for it an oath of obedience to 'wholesome' laws. By many the change was unnoticed, it was so slight; but it was made, as Cotton says, to guard against 'Some Episcopal and malignant practices,' and this left it very loose. There is little room for doubt that the real reason was, that in case of necessity the new oath might be interpreted to transfer allegiance from the English crown to the local government, and to make it one step in that series of shrewd movements by which the colony finally became independent. Williams's mistake lay in that he began to preach against it earnestly from a religious point of view. The old oath was an oath, and was administered to 'unregenerate men,' and the new oath did not affect him personally as an unregenerate man, so that he need not to have preached about it at all. To him the oath was an act of worship, and he might have left the unregenerate man to judge for himself as to whether or not it were an act of worship to him also. His view of the civil oath was clearly a mistake, yet it is unfair to judge either him or the Court by the practice of the present day, in the use of the oath. Until recent years, men have been excluded from testifying in courts of justice because their religious belief or unbelief failed to qualify them to take certain oaths or forms of oath. Inasmuch as he was not an 'unregenerate' man he could have taken the new oath or not, as an act of worship, and have left other men to follow their own consciences. But both he and the Court had come to that point of contest where each stickled stubbornly for little things and magnified them to a wondrous importance.

A charge is also made that Williams instigated Endicott to cut the red cross out of the flag of England, on the ground that it was given to the king by the pope as an ensign of victory, and so was a superstitious thing and a

relic of antichrist. Whoever did this committed a grievous political offense against the crown, but Williams is not conclusively identified therewith, nor is it even charged against him by the Court, so that if this charge were a mere report, and yet was allowed to weigh in his condemnation, to that extent the Court treated him unjustly. Endicott was tried and punished for cutting out the red cross. He pleaded that he did this not from any motives of treason to the crown, but from his hatred of idolatry, whereupon he was excluded from the magistracy for one year, a light punishment, because as the examining Committee of the Court reported: 'He did it out of tenderness of conscience, and not of any evil intention.' Roger Williams might have held the same opinion, but in this he was not singular, nor has it been alleged that he was suspected of treason on any point. If however, as Hubbard affirms, he 'Inspired some persons of great interest that the cross ought to be taken away,' he only shared a very popular opinion in the colony at the time. The governor himself had called a meeting of all the clergy of the colony, in Boston, January 19th, 1635, and submitted to them this question: 'Whether it be lawful for us to carry the cross in our banners?' They warmly discussed this query, all the pastors being present, except Mr. Ward, of Ipswich, and 'For the matter of the cross,' says Winthrop, 'they were divided, and so deferred it to another meeting.' Felt treats fully of the affair, saying: 'Some of the congress, though not large in number, yet of vital consequences in their advice, approve the display of such a sign, and others think it should be laid aside. Both parties are fully aware that its omission is calculated to bring on the colonists a charge of treason against regal supremacy.'

When Endicott was called to account, the authorities were obliged to defer the question to the next session, because they were undecided

'Whether the ensigns should be laid by in regard that many refused to follow them.' Meanwhile, the Board of War required 'That all the ensigns should be laid aside;' and in May, 1635, a motion was made to exchange the red cross for the red and white rose, being a symbol of union between the houses of York and Lancaster. They recommended that an attempt be made to 'Still their minds, who stood stiff for the cross,' until harmony should ensue concerning the matter. It appears that this cross in the banner was a subject of universal agitation amongst the colonists, that the Court and pastors were divided about it, that Hooker had sent forth a treatise on the subject, and that the 'assembled freemen' seriously proposed to supplant it by the 'roses,' while the 'Board of War' had actually laid it aside for the time being. Still, Roger Williams, who did not cut it out, is made the greatest sinner of all in the 'Bay,' perhaps, for not doing this. Joseph Felt, no friend to Williams, artlessly shows with what light seriousness this grave Court took the punishment of Endicott for his high crime:

'While many of the colonists entertained an opinion like his own about the cross, he expressed his in the overt act of cutting it from the standard, and therefore was made an example. State policy rendered it needful for him thus to suffer in order to appease the resentment of the court party in London, for such a seeming denial of the royal supremacy. But for this, there is reason to believe that he would have received applause rather than blame. As evidence that the same body, while so dealing with him by constraint for the sake of keeping the commonwealth from a far greater evil, sympathized with him in his affliction, they place him on a board of surveyors to run the line between Ipswich and Newbury...The ministers had engaged to correspond with their friends in England for advisement in the controversy.'

Of course it was essential to the very existence of the colony that the loyalty of the

colonists should not be suspected in England, lest the charter might be revoked, as already the Privy Council had issued an order for its production. But who had done the most to create ill-feeling between the crown and the colony, Roger Williams or the magistrates? He had insisted that they must break fellowship with the English Church; they had driven its members out of the country with the Prayer-Book in their hands, and had made membership in Congregational Churches the test of citizenship in the Bay. He declared, that neither the king nor the Court, in Massachusetts, had any control over the First Table of the Law of God, their power extending only to the body, goods and outward state of men. They had formally resolved, that if the king sent a general governor to rule over them and their goods, they ought not to accept him, but would defend their lawful possessions against him, and they fortified their strongholds to that end. He had an inchoate conception that a separation between Church and State should take place both in England and America; they had a settled conviction and policy that they would be separate from the control of the English Church, with bishops and a king at its head, cost what it might; yet, that he should be compelled at like cost, to submit to the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts, with a governor and Council at their head. Which party was the most exasperating to the crown does not appear; nor does it appear that England ever suspected Roger Williams of disloyalty. On the contrary, it threatened the colony with the withdrawal of the patent and the appointment of a governor; whereas, it gave him a new patent for Rhode Island, without question.

The third and fourth offenses charged against Williams were purely on religious subjects. It was quite severe in him to refuse to listen to the parish priest of England, when in

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

England, and quite likely to give offense there; but was it soothing in the extreme to the English government to be told by these Congregational authorities, that its Episcopal ordination was scouted and cast aside in Massachusetts Bay, that its churches were not allowed there at all, much less that its own Episcopal colonists were not allowed to hear their own ministers preach on this side of the water, 'lawful' or unlawful? Both these were religious opinions, 'Broached and divulged' equally, but why Roger should be banished for refusing a hearing to the Episcopal clergy in England, from their own pulpits, and the Massachusetts Court should not banish itself for refusing them even a Prayer-Book or a pulpit to preach from in that colony, is not easily seen.

So candid man acquainted with the subject can doubt that the Church and State were blended in Massachusetts Bay, that the magistrates there were expected to punish 'breaches of the First Table,' and that every man's religious convictions with their free expression were understood to be within the purview of the civil authorities. So skillfully mixed were the charges against Williams, that under such a government they could scarcely be separated. It is apparent that both his political and spiritual offenses entered into the considerations for his banishment and were intended to enter into it, so that it is impossible to say, whether one set of the charges would have been sufficient to secure this end without the other. The common understanding of their own times and of after times has been, that the chief reasons for his banishment were of the religious character. This is suggested in the undeniable fact, that to hold and utter Christian sentiments opposed to theirs was a crime with them, both before and after the banishment of Williams. The manner in which they sentenced others to banishment, purely for their religious 'opinions,' with the stress laid upon his religious

positions, shows conclusively, that the *gravamen* of his offense was not political but religious. They had determined from the time of banishing the Browns, that all should conform to their form of religion or leave the colony. Early in 1635 the Court entreated: 'The brethren and elders of every Church within this jurisdiction, that they will consult and advise of one uniform order of discipline in the Churches, and then to consider how far the magistrates are bound to interpose for the preservation of that uniformity and peace of the Churches.' The Court, at the time of Williams's banishment, pronounced the same sentence upon John Smyth, a Dorchester miller: 'For divers dangerous opinions, which he holdeth and hath divulged.' The fair inference is, that they were the same opinions with those of Williams, as Smyth became one of the founders of Providence, and of whom Williams himself says: 'I consented to John Smyth, miller at Dorchester (banished also), to go with me.' Whatever his 'opinions' were, they were merely 'opinions;' and no overt acts of civil wrong are alleged against him. Smyth and Williams were banished October, 1635; and on March 3d, 1636, the General Assembly ordered that it would not thereafter

'Approve of any companies of men, as shall henceforth join in any pretended way of Church fellowship, without they shall first acquaint the magistrates and the elders of the greater part of the Churches in this jurisdiction with their intentions, and have their approbation therein...No person being a member of any Church which shall hereafter be gathered without the approbation of the magistrates and the greater part of said Churches, shall be admitted to the freedom of this commonwealth.'

The animus of all this is clearly seen in their subsequent acts, as well as in the wording of these laws. On the '30th of the 3d month, 1636,'

The American Baptists

the Council sent a command from Boston, 'to the constable of Salem,' to inform 'divers persons' there, that their 'course is very offensive to the government here and may no longer be suffered.' What had they done?

They do 'within your town' 'disorderly assemble themselves both on the Lord's day and at other times, contemptuously refusing to come to the solemn meetings of the Church there, (or being some of them justly cast out) do obstinately refuse to submit themselves, that they might be again received; but do make conventions, and seduce divers persons of weak capacity, and have already withdrawn some of them from the Church, and hereby have caused much (not only disturbance to the Church, but also) disorders and damage in the civil State.'

Here we see that they regarded disorder and damage to the State, to consist in withdrawing from the Church, 'hereby' they have 'caused' the 'damage.' And what should be done with these transgressors? The constable must command them to

'Refrain all such disorderly assemblies, and pretended Church-meetings; and either to conform themselves to the laws and orders of this government, being established according to the rule of God's word; or else let them be assured that we shall by God's assistance take some such strict and speedy course for the reformation of these disorders, and preventing the evils which may otherwise ensue, as our duty to God and charge over his people do call for from us.'

This document is signed by Vane, governor, Winthrop, deputy, and Dudley.

What they found it their duty to do with these wicked folk, who would worship God elsewhere in Salem than at the State Church, is stated in the records of the General Court of 1638, thus: 'Ezekiel Holliman appeared upon summons, because he did not frequent the public assemblies, and for seducing many, he

was referred by the Court to the ministers for conviction.' Holliman, as we shall see, was another of the founders of Providence and the person who baptized Williams there. When in Salem neither of them were Baptists on the subject of ordinances, which leaves the implication that their views were one on the question of liberty of conscience and the power of the magistrates to interfere with religion. And the conduct of the magistrates themselves, in punishing the Salem Church, shows that they were actuated chiefly by religious considerations in the whole transaction. That Church had neither denounced the patent, nor cut out the cross, nor denied the oath to unregenerate men, much less had it incurred the wrath of England. It had, however, alleged its rights as a Church to choose its own pastor without consulting the civil authorities, and had protested against the right of the Court to disturb its pastoral relations with him, for which it must be chastised. This unpardonable offense entered even into the Marblehead land affair, whatever mistake the Salem Church fell into, in writing to the other Churches concerning the Church discipline of their members in the Court. Concerning the petition of the 'Salem men,' which Winthrop says: 'They did challenge as belonging to that town,' he also bluntly adds: 'Because they had chosen Mr. Williams their teacher while he stood under question of authority, and so offered contempt to the magistracy, etc., their petition was refused,' Again he says, that the act of the Salem Church in calling him to the office of a teacher 'at that time was judged *a great contempt of authority*. So in fine there was given to him and the Church of Salem to consider of these things till the next General Court, and then either to give satisfaction to the Court, or else to expect the sentence.' Nor is this all, but he writes that the Court and ministers were of this mind, namely: 'That they who should obstinately maintain

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

such opinions 'would run the Church' into heresy, apostasy or tyranny, and yet the civil magistrates could not intermeddle.' This shows that Williams had struck a blow at the authority of the civil officers to interfere in Church matters, which they felt keenly, as well as the fact that the Court reached this result on the 'advice' of the ministers. What had the ministers to do with the case if it only concerned civil authorities? The correspondence of the Salem Church conducted by Williams and Elder Sharpe, with the Boston and other Churches, was between purely religious bodies, though it involved a political subject. But the Court must needs meddle with the matter, declare Salem 'rebellious' and 'insubordinate,' and their three deputies were sent home, leaving that town without representation, and requiring them to report what citizens of Salem had indorsed these steps there. It decreed that: 'If the major part of the freemen of Salem shall disclaim the letters sent lately from the Church of Salem to several Churches, it shall then be lawful for them to send deputies to the General Court.' Williams was expelled in the absence of the Salem deputies, and then Elder Sharpe was required to report whether Salem acknowledged its offense or not. Salem was thus brought to humble submission, and Williams was excluded from the Church there; not for 'sedition,' but because he denied the 'Churches of the Bay to be true Churches;' so says Hugh Peter, his successor.

Soon after Williams's banishment a controversy excited the colony concerning the preaching of a Mr. Wheelwright, at Braintree, about a covenant of grace and a covenant of works, involving antinomianism and he was banished. Winthrop in justifying the Court in his case, 1637, against those who complained said: 'If we find his *opinions* such as will cause divisions, and make people look to their magistrates, ministers and brethren as enemies

to Christ, antichrists, etc, were it not sin and unfaithfulness in us to receive more of their *opinions* which we already find the evil fruit of? Nay, why do not those, who now complain join us in keeping out such, as well as formerly they did in expelling Mr. Williams FOR THE LIKE though less dangerous.' Here the governor tells us, in his honest bluntness, that Williams was 'expelled' for his opinions on religious subjects, which were less dangerous than those of Wheelwright. The plea of all persecutors has ever been that they persecuted no man for his religion, but for 'sedition' and 'disturbance of the public peace.' This was the pretense of the pagans when they tormented the early Christians, of the Catholics in the case of the Waldensians, the Hollanders and the Lollards, and now the apologists of the Puritans put in that plea for them. When the Browns and their Prayer-Books were packed off to England, Endicott said that they 'endangered faction and mutiny;' and when Thomas Painter of Bingham was whipped in July, 1644, for refusing to have his child christened, his judges said, that it was 'not for his opinions, but for reproaching the Lord's ordinance;' as if his opinion of infant baptism was not the very reproach which he threw upon it and for which he was punished.

The same pretense is now set up against Roger Williams, in the allegation that he was banished for civil cause alone, directly in the face of his sentence, which charges upon him: 'New and dangerous opinions against the authority of the magistrates.' Yet, in no instance did he dispute their right to civil office, or charge them with civil usurpation, nor did he refuse to obey them in purely civil matters; but he dared to question their assumption of religious authority outside of their proper sphere as civil officers. Joseph Felt bewails his sentence, as disturbing 'the benevolent feelings of every heart,' and regrets it, 'as a serious impediment to the prosperous progress of the

commonwealth, and a dark omen that its hopes of spirituality and duration may be soon scattered.' Then he says of the authorities: 'Believing themselves bound to exclude persons who, they suppose, entertain principles subversive of their civil and ecclesiastical polity, the General Court engage in so unpleasant a service.' Neither did the Court itself proceed against him as against a civil criminal. Trial by jury is more than once insisted upon in Magna Charta, as the principal bulwark of an Englishman's liberty, but especially does Chap. xxix insist that no freeman shall be hurt in his person or property 'except by the legal judgment of his peers and the law of the land.' Hence, the royal charter granted to Massachusetts could not abridge the great rights of British freemen which had been secured by Magna Charta, nor could it deprive a colonist of the right of trial by jury; a right which had been a vital part of the British Constitution from the time of King John. Neither could the charter authorize the governor and company of Massachusetts Bay to inflict unusual penalties in punishment of sedition, or the disturbance of the public peace, without the form of a public trial. On the contrary, all the rights of Englishmen were secured to the colonists by the charter, but Roger Williams was simply persecuted out of the colony, without the due observance of even this form. In a word, there is no precedent for this trial, no authority for it in common law or the chartered rights of the colony. A new process or procedure appears to have been invented on the spot and at the time for his case, the effect of which was, that he suffered under an *ex post facto* law. Instead of proceeding as a court of civil jurisprudence to produce and examine witnesses, about the first step which they took was to appoint Hooker, the pastor at Newtown, to 'dispute' with him. This he did, but found it impossible 'to seduce him from any of his

errors' (not crimes), for that he 'maintained all his opinions.' Dr. Dexter says of Williams: 'They asked him whether he would take the whole subject into still further consideration; proposing that he employ another month in reflection, and then come and argue the matter before them.' Again, he says, that the Court 'appointed Thomas Hooker (a brother pastor) to go over these points in argument with him; on the spot, in the endeavor to make him see his errors. One single glimpse of this debate is afforded us by Mr. Cotton.' This last word expresses the bearings of the whole proceeding. It was a 'debate,' an argument concerning certain alleged religious errors, and not a trial in any proper legal sense of the word. Winthrop says that Williams maintained 'all his opinions;' and Williams understood the same thing, for he says, that he was not only ready to be 'banished, but to die also in New England, as for most holy truths of God in Christ Jesus'

Barry, in his 'History of Massachusetts,' says (p. 239): 'Meanwhile the elders continued to deal with him for his errors and to labor for his conversion; and Mr. Cotton spent the great part of the summer in seeking, by word and writing, to satisfy his scruples. Informing the magistrates of their desire to proceed with him in a Church way before civil prosecution was urged, the governor replied: "You are deceived in him if you think he will condescend to learn of any of you."'

The first element of a trial for civil wrongdoing does not appear in the whole process, nor can a like case be found in the records of civil trials under English law, outside of the Star Chamber. Not a witness was examined, no counsel was heard, and none of the forms of law invariably observed in sedition or disturbance of the public peace, were had. His banishment was a religious and not a State necessity, which Williams well characterized, when he declares it to have been 'Most

Chapter 2 - Banishment of Roger Williams

lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Jesus Christ.'

The apologists of the Puritans make a great outcry against Williams for saying that the king had no right to grant the lands to the colonists, because they belonged to the natives. And was he singular in this opinion? No. Cotton writes: 'There be many, if not most, that hold, that we have not our land merely by right of patent from the king, but that the natives are true owners of all that they possess or improve. Neither do I know any amongst us that either then were, or now are, of another mind.' Yet, he says that these freemen 'Are tolerated to enjoy both civil and religious liberties amongst us.' Then, why was Williams banished for believing what Cotton says every body else believed? Cotton tells us that he was guilty of these two things, he was 'violent' in preaching against the patent, and he presented the matter unfairly, for they had not taken the lands on the king's patent. Cotton claims that the lands were 'void places,' made so 'by pestilence, which had swept away thousands of the natives' 'a little before our coming.' They therefore took nothing from the king or the natives, but inhabited the country by the 'law of nature.' Williams somehow got it into his head, that if the small-pox had swept away thousands of the Indian fathers 'a little before our coming,' the land on which their bones fell might possibly belong to their children; and so he had religious scruples on the point, and ventured to state them vehemently in the pulpit, when he ought to have held his tongue; and for which he was banished. It had been better for Cotton to be quiet than to disgrace the magistrates by such petty special pleading as this. He calls Williams 'violent' and 'vehement:' but Winthrop who knew him intimately pronounces him 'A man lovely in his carriage.'

Our best historians find his banishment as purely a religious affair as it could be under that

union of Church and State which Massachusetts has now repudiated as unworthy of retention.

Bradford holds the magistrates 'Inexcusable in their treatment of Roger Williams...merely for his honest independence of opinion.' Peck thinks him 'A very troublesome man for bigotry to manage...When he entered Massachusetts, he was in advance of the general sentiment of the Puritans on the question of religious liberty...Roger Williams was more than a Puritan. He was the great mind ordained of Providence to advance beyond the position of indignant protest against oppression, to the revelation that the highest right must itself be the result of a freedom which might be abused by consenting to the deepest wrong. He was the first true type of the American freeman, conceding fully to others the highborn rights which he claimed for himself. This was further than Puritanism could lead the race; and, for the present, it was not ready to follow. He denied the right to coerce a man to take a freeman's oath; but would not he himself be compelled to take it? No, he refused: and such was the firm dignity of his bearing, that the government was forced to desist from that proceeding. But he was living under a religion established by law, not Prelacy, but Puritanism, in which intolerance was just as vile to him, and just as determined against a Non-conformist.'

The unvarnished fact seems to be, that like honest Saul of Tarsus they meant to be men of God, but like him allowed all their religion to run into personal conscience, without much regard to the consciences of others. Their primary blunder lay in overlooking the spiritual laws of the Church of Christ, and applying both to Church and State the judicial enactments of Moses, which were made for the government of a civil nation 1,500 years before the Christian Church existed. Roger Williams himself well expresses their mistake in these words: 'Although they professed to be bound by such judicials only as contained in them moral

equity, yet they extended this moral equity to so many particulars as to make it the whole judicial law.' But the Christian law for the government of the commonwealth leaves all punishment to be governed under the sway of the natural rights of man and the highest good of the States where they are used. Hence, in adopting the Mosaic penalties they not only cast aside, in some cases, what was known as 'crown law,' but with it the common law of England. Barry puts the case forcibly, saying:

'Puritans as well as Episcopalians assumed their own infallibility; and, as Church and State were one and inseparable in Old England, they were bound together in New England; and the purity of the former was deemed indispensable to the safety of the latter. This policy was resolutely adhered to, and the laws which sanctioned it were as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians.' Governor Winthrop saw his mistake when it was too late. Barry says: 'He regretted the harshness with which Roger Williams was treated; and though a zealous opponent of Mrs. Hutchinson and the enthusiastic Gorton, as he advanced in life his spirit became more catholic and he lamented the errors of the past; so that, when urged by Mr. Dudley to sign an order for the banishment of one deemed heterodox, he replied, "I have done enough of that work already."'

Since Jesus was sentenced to death in Asia, on the cool verdict that he was a 'just man' in whom no 'fault' was found, a sublimer sight has not appeared to man than that revealed in America on that crisp October morning in 1635. This master in Israel looms up head and shoulders above his Puritan judges. Without a

stammer or a blush he reaches the full height of manhood; whereupon the Bay sentences him to a new leadership. In Salem God threw the mantle of William the Silent upon the shoulders of the brave Welshman. What, if Massachusetts did lay her political sins on his head, and send her scapegoat to bear them into the desert? He was strong to carry the burden of her congregation and elders. He remembered Pilate, and quietly held the bowl for this ancient Court of the Bay to sink its sins in the shallows of a basin. He watched the experiment in the simplicity of a child's faith, in the firmness of a martyr's will, in the resignation of a cavalier, in the calmness of a hero; for God was with him.

For that hour God brought him into the world. The persecution of two worlds inspired him to discover a third, where the wicked should cease from troubling, in that sort. A veteran before his sun had readied noon, nerved with a judicial love of liberty, fired with a hallowed zeal to liberate all the conscience-bound, he is now ready to give life to a new age. Roger, get thee gone into the woods to thy work! And when alone with God may he work his will in thee!

'Speak, History. Who are life's victors? Unroll thy long annals and say, Are they those whom the world called victors, who won the success of a day? The martyrs, or Nero? The Spartans who fell at Thermopylae's tryst, Or the Persians and Xerxes? His judges or Socrates? Pilate or Christ?'

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

Salem was filled with excitement and grief when Williams was banished, and asked what its good pastor had done to merit this cruelty at the hands of his fellow-disciples in Christ? John Cotton, snugly housed in his Boston home, severely disconcerted on Williams's exile as any thing but 'banishment.' In that dreary New England winter, as his brother plunged into the depths of the forests, he spoke of it as a 'large and fruitful' land, in which he enjoyed simple 'enlargement.' But Cotton was careful not to break the command by coveting that 'enlargement' for himself, nor did he so hanker after the delicious fruits of the wilderness as to follow his brother, to rejoice with him in his tribulation. Indeed, he queries whether it was a 'punishment at all,' and one would rather catch the impression from his showing, that the Court had simply sent him on a restful excursion, in absolute dereliction of its duty to punish crime. The illustrious hero himself thought that Cotton might have seen the matter in another light, 'Had his soul been in my soul's case, exposed to the miseries, poverties, necessities, debts and hardships,' which he endured. The weak people of Salem also wept as if their hearts would break, that he was driven they knew not where, 'for they were much taken with the apprehension of his godliness.' Neal says, that the whole town was in an uproar, that they raised the 'cry of persecution,' and 'that he would have carried off the greater part of the inhabitants of the town, if the ministers of Boston had not interfered.' These admonished the Church at Salem for sympathizing with one who had been driven out of civilization as a felon.

Upham, the careful historian of the Salem Church, says: 'They adhered to him long and faithfully, and sheltered him from all assaults. And when at last he was sentenced by the General Court to banishment from the colony

on account of his principles, we cannot but admire the fidelity of that friendship which prompted many of his congregation to accompany him in his exile, and partake of his fortunes when an outcast upon the earth.' Thanks to Salem, its loss was the world's gain. That day, out of the weak came forth strength, and out of the bitter came forth sweetness. Good old Puritan city of witchcraft and halts, out of thee, as from Salem of old, went forth an illustrious exile: the first to redeem the souls of men, and the other to give fifty millions of them soul liberty. Men intended only evil in both cases, but God overruled their aims for good. His eye rested on this wanderer in the New World, and his voice told him what to do and where to go.

We now follow Roger Williams into those wild tracts of nature where the wolf, the bear and the panther roamed in all their voracity. Perpetual hardships had given the wild tribes of that region compact and well-knit bodies, which could subsist for days on a handful of corn. Aside from this, with their fish and game, they had little food in the depth of winter, knowing nothing of salted meats, and often they were sorely pinched with hunger. So far as appears, Williams entered the desert without a weapon, bow or arrow, spear or club, hatchet or gun, to hunt for bird or beast, and every esculent root was frozen in the ground and buried in the snow. That winter was signally bitter and he felt its keen severity. It seems to have haunted his mind in 1652, when he dedicated his 'Hireling Ministry' to Charles II, in the epistle to which, he calls New England a 'miserable, cold, howling wilderness.' Without bread or bed for fourteen weeks, and the first white man who had ever wandered in those mazes, he regarded himself cared for of God as miraculously as was Elijah, and he sang this song in his desolate pilgrimage:

'God's Providence is rich to his,
Let some distrustful be;
In wilderness in great distress,
These ravens have fed me!'

The bronzed barbarians through whose lands he passed were superstitious, ferocious and often treacherous. He would not have been safe for an hour, had not his kind acts toward them been noised through their tribes. While at Plymouth he had gone forth amongst them, had visited their wigwams, learned their language and preached to them the good news of the kingdom; and now his love governed the wild element in their bosoms when he had no power over fierce winter storms. He knew their chiefs or sachems, and on reaching their settlements on Narraganset Bay, his sufferings touched the savage heart. They remembered his former kindness, welcomed him to Indian hospitality, and Massasoit took him to his cabin as he would a brother. Here he bought a tract of land, pitched his tent, and with the opening spring began to plant and build on the east bank of the Seekonk River. Immediately, however, he received a friendly letter from Winslow, Governor of Plymouth, advising him to cross the river and push farther into the wilderness, as he was too near the boundary line of that colony. Seeking and pursuing peace, he and his companions took a canoe, shot into the stream and made their way down to a little cove near India Point, when a company of Indians hailed them with a friendly salutation which they had caught from the English: 'What cheer?' There they tarried for a time, but kept on round the Point to the mouth of the Moshassuck River, where a delicious spring of water invited them to land. Casting around for a resting-place in the dense forest, where wild beasts and savages hemmed them in from their Christian brethren, and where they were far enough from persecuting Christians to give Christianity fair

play, they stood on holy ground. Under a bright June sky, with a soil around them which was unpolluted by the foot of oppression and a virgin fountain laughing at their feet, for the first time in life their bosoms swelled full free to worship God. There he said of his harsh brethren: 'I had the country before me, and might be as free as themselves, and we should be loving neighbors together.' He built an altar there, and called the name of that place Providence; for he said, 'God has been merciful to me in my distress!'

There he bought land of the Indians for the Providence plantations, and in June, 1636, laid the foundation-stone of the freest city and State on earth; a republic of true liberty, a perpetual memorial to the unseen Finger that pointed out the hallowed spot. To this day that virgin stream remains unmingled with a tear drawn from the eye by Christian cruelty, nor has religious despotism yet forced a drop of blood there from the veins of God's elect. The first concern of its illustrious founder was, that this new home should be 'a shelter to persons distressed for conscience.' The compact drawn reads thus: 'We whose names are here underwritten, being desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to submit ourselves in active and passive obedience, to all such orders or agencies as shall be made for public good of the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a township, and such others whom they shall admit into the same, only in civil things.' Here we find the first germ of that great modern doctrine which he afterward avowed in his 'Bloody Tenet' in these words: 'The sovereign power of all civil authority is founded in the consent of the people.' Also, this simple compact sweeps away at a stroke every allegation that he was banished for civil wrongs, and that the religious aspects of his

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

case were an after-thought. Those who make that allegation are bound by self-respect as well as historic justice to show on what line of human motive Williams, exiled for faction and sedition, should, in organizing a new government, first exact the bond that no man under that government should ever be 'molested for his conscience.' How do the antecedents of such alleged civil crime express themselves in such a sequence? No; here, as elsewhere, human nature was true to itself. That which had been cruelly denied in Massachusetts and for which he had suffered the loss of all things, should now be secured at all hazard. Each man reserved to himself the rights of conscience, which no number of the 'major' part might touch, and that at once was made an inalienable right; all else in 'civil things' could be risked as of minor consequence.

We have already seen that from the Swiss Baptists of 1527, the Dutch Baptists, the Confessions of 1611 and others, this doctrine had gone forth to do its work and had been a cardinal principle with all Baptists. Also, that William of Orange was the first of rulers in the old governments who embodied it in an existing constitution; but the honor was reserved for Roger Williams of making it the foundation-stone on which human government should stand; because conscience is the regnant power to which all obligation appeals in the individual man. This demanded from Bancroft, our great historian, that memorable utterance which has been sneered at as 'rhetoric,' by men who are unworthy to untie the latchet of his shoe; although as an honest chronicler he could not withhold this testimony concerning Roger Williams:

'He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of the liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law...Williams would permit persecution of no opinion, no

religion, leaving heresy unharmed by law, and orthodoxy unprotected by the terrors of penal statutes...We praise the man who first analyzed the air, or resolved water into its elements, or drew the lightning from the clouds, even though the discoveries may have been as much the fruits of time as of genius. A moral principle has a much wider and nearer influence on human happiness; nor can any discovery of truth be of more direct benefit of society, than that which establishes a perpetual religious peace, and spreads tranquillity through every community and every bosom. If Copernicus is held in perpetual reverence, because, on his death-bed, he published to the world that the sun is the center of our system; if the name of Kepler is preserved in the annals of human excellence for his sagacity in detecting the laws of the planetary motion; if the genius of Newton has been almost adored for dissecting a ray of light and weighing heavenly bodies in a balance – let there be for the name of Roger Williams at least some humble place among those who have advanced moral science and made themselves the benefactors of mankind.'

In 1872 the Congress of the United States had placed a memorial of Roger Williams in the National Capitol, and Senator Anthony, January 9, delivered a eulogy of great justice and beauty, in which he paid the following tribute to the immortal defender of soul liberty:

'In all our history no name shines with a purer light than his whose memorial we have lately placed in the Capitol. In the history of all the world there is no more striking example of a man grasping a grand idea, at once, in its full proportions, in all its completeness, and carrying it out, unflinchingly, to its remotest legitimate results. Roger Williams did not merely lay the foundations of religious freedom, he constructed the whole edifice, in all its impregnable strength, and in all its imperishable beauty. Those who have followed him in the same spirit have not been able to add any thing to the grand and simple words in which he enunciated the principle, nor to surpass him in the exact fidelity with which he reduced it to the practical business

The American Baptists

of government. Religious freedom, which now, by general consent, underlies the foundation principles of civilized government, was, at that time, looked upon as a wilder theory than any proposition, moral, political, or religious, that has since engaged the serious attention of mankind. It was regarded as impracticable, disorganizing, impious, and, if not utterly subversive of social order, it was not so only because its manifest absurdity would prevent any serious effort to enforce it. The lightest punishment deemed due to its confessor was to drive him out into the howling wilderness. Had he not met with more Christian treatment from the savage children of the forest than he had found from "the Lord's anointed," he would have perished in the beginning of his experiment...Such a man was Roger Williams. No thought of himself, no idea of recompense or of praise, interfered to sully the perfect purity of his motives, the perfect disinterestedness of his conduct. Laboring for the highest benefit of his fellow-men, he was entirely indifferent to their praises. He knew (for God, whose prophet he was, revealed it to him) that the great principle for which he contended, and for which he suffered, founded in the eternal fitness of things, would endure forever. He did not inquire if his name would survive a generation. In his vision of the future, he saw mankind emancipated from the thralldom of priestcraft, from the blindness of bigotry, from the cruelties of intolerance. He saw the nations walking forth in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.'

Yet this statement expresses no more than the general conviction of the American public. Recently, a leading New York daily of weighty influence said: 'Baptists have solved a great problem. They combine the most resolute conviction, the most stubborn belief in their own special doctrines, with the most admirable tolerance of the faith of other Christians. And this combination of sturdy faith with graceful tolerance makes it easy to recognize them as the followers of Roger Williams.' Indeed, the best thinkers in Europe begin to unite in this

sentiment. Long since Gervinus, the profound German, said of Williams, that he founded a 'New society in Rhode Island upon the principles of entire liberty of conscience and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular concerns,...which principles have not only maintained themselves here, but have spread over the whole Union...and given laws to one quarter of the globe, and, dreaded for their moral influence, they stand in the background of every democratic struggle in Europe.' Williams had the choice before him of direct hostility between the Church and State, as in the pagan days of early Christianity; an alliance between them as in Constantine's day; a supremacy of the Church over the State, as in the Middle Ages: or entire independence of each other, earnest, friendly, helpful in the common weal. Cavour wished for 'Free Churches in a free State,' having borrowed the ideal of Roger Williams. The first publicists of our age are the most ready to credit him and his coadjutors with linking liberty to law, and with proving that a voluntary religion is the determined foe of license on the one hand and of tyranny on the other, when they exercise their free life independently of each other.

This point he set forth fully not only in its practical bearings, but he defined and defended it unmistakably in his works. When in London, in 1644, he published his 'Bloody Tenet of Persecution for Cause of Conscience;' in 1647 John Cotton replied in his 'Bloody Tenet Washed and Made White;' and Williams rejoined in his 'Bloody Tenet yet more Bloody,' in 1652. Williams took the broad ground throughout that no man can be held responsible to his fellow-man for his religious belief. Cotton attempted to take new ground, but failed, and was obliged to fall back upon the old Catholic view. He denied the right to persecute men 'for conscience rightly informed.' But if a man's conscience is 'erroneous and blind in

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

fundamental and weighty matters,' then the magistrate may admonish him on the subject; and if he remains 'willfully blind and criminally obstinate,' then the magistrate may punish him. This makes the civil power the sole judge of fundamental error, willful blindness and cruel obstinacy, and covers all that the Catholic powers ever claimed on the subject. When the principles of Williams were distorted and he was charged with sustaining anarchy to the destruction of civil government, he wrote his immortal letter on the question, which has been denominated a 'classic,' and will scarcely perish for ages. Amongst other things he said:

'There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls on one ship, whose weal or woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or a human combination or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm, that all the liberty of conscience, that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges: that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, nor compelled from their own particular prayers or worship if they practice any. I further add, that I never denied, that notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course, yea, and also command that justice, peace and sobriety be kept and practiced both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help, in person or purse, toward the common charges or defense; if any refuse to obey the common laws and order of the ship concerning their common peace or preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders or officers because all are equal in Christ, therefore, no masters or officers, no laws or orders, no corrections or punishments; I say, I never denied, but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander

or commanders may judge, resist, compel and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits. This, if seriously and honestly minded, may, if it please the Father of lights, let in some light to such as willingly shut not their eyes.'

It would be interesting to trace the further history of his life and of Rhode Island in their defense and application of the liberty of conscience, but it must suffice to say, that during the rest of his days Williams remained its faithful exponent and defender, he had followed his convictions on that subject from the Episcopalians to the Congregationalists, from them to the Baptists, and from them to the Seekers. But in these changes his personal religious character remained without a spot; he gave the same large liberty to all others which he took for himself, he respected their motives and convictions, and in his controversies with them left no trace of acerbity. His personal services to all the New England colonies, by skillful negotiations with the Indians, which twice saved them from a general war that might have exterminated them, can hardly be overestimated. Bancroft justly characterizes his exertions in breaking the Pequod league as 'a most intrepid and successful achievement,' 'an action as perilous in its execution as it was fortunate in its issue.'

The youthful reader will be grateful for a fuller detail of these facts, which is here attempted in brief. In the fall of 1636, only six months after the flight of Williams into the wilderness, he found that the Indian tribes were forming a league for the destruction of the English, and at once informed the Governor of Massachusetts of the plot in order to save them. Passion ran high on the part of that colony and on the part of the red men, and the Massachusetts government asked him to step in as mediator between them. This was the exile's prompt reply:

The American Baptists

'The Lord helped me immediately to put my life into my hand, and, scarce acquainting my wife, to ship myself alone, in a poor canoe, and to cut through a stormy wind, with great seas, every minute in hazard of life, to the sachems' house. Three days and nights my business forced me to lodge and mix with the bloody Pequod ambassadors, whose hands and arms, me thought, reeked with the blood of my countrymen, murdered and massacred by them on Connecticut River, and from whom I could not but nightly look for their bloody knives at my own throat also. God wonderously preserved me, and helped me to break to pieces the Pequods' negotiation and design; and to make and finish, by many travels and charges, the English league with the Narragansetts and Mohegans against the Pequods.'

This resulted in a lasting treaty of peace, which was written in English, which language the Indians could not understand, and a copy was sent by Massachusetts to Williams, with the request that he would interpret it to them. Thus, the illustrious exile served and saved the country from whence he was banished, while his bones were yet aching with the hardships of his journey, in beautiful illustration of his Master's words, Luke 6:22,23,27,28. With the artless simplicity of a child, he tells Winthrop of his interview with Canonicus, the great chief, in the interests of Massachusetts.

He says of this warrior that he 'was very sour, and accused the English and myself for sending the plague amongst them, and threatening to kill him especially. Such tidings it seems were lately brought to his ears by some of his flatterers and our ill-willers. I discerned cause of bestirring myself and stayed the longer, and at last, through the mercy of the Most High, I not only sweetened his spirit, but possessed him, that the plague and other sicknesses were alone in the hand of the one God, who made him and us, who being displeased with the English for lying, stealing, idleness and uncleanness, the natives'

epidemical sins, smote many thousands of us ourselves with general and late mortalities.'

And how did Massachusetts treat him, when he heaped these glowing coals of Christian love on her head? Let us see. He went to England to procure a charter, being obliged to take a ship from the Dutch settlement, and when he returned, in 1644, with the instrument which gave his people an independent government, in order that he might land in Boston, several nobles and Parliament men gave him a gracious letter commending him to the authorities of Massachusetts, but they treated him rudely and as still a banished man. Hubbard says, in their defense (p. 349), that 'They saw no reason to condemn themselves for any former proceedings against Mr. Williams; but for any offices of Christian love and duties of humanity they were willing to maintain a mutual correspondence with him. But as to his dangerous principles of separation, unless he can be brought to lay them down, they see no reason why to concede to him, or any so persuaded, free liberty of ingress and egress lest any of their people should be drawn away from his erroneous principles.' Well may John Callender, 'that disciple whom Jesus loved,' say of him in his own manly manner: 'Mr. Williams appears, by the whole course and tenor of his life and conduct here, to have been one of the most disinterested men that ever lived, a most pious and heavenly-minded soul.' (Hist. Dis., p. 17.) And this judgment of his wisdom, magnanimity and goodness, is shared by the great everywhere. Southey called him the 'best and greatest of the Welshmen,' and Archbishop Whately, who venerated his memory as a great benefactor of mankind, paid him well-merited praise, for he never corrupted any man by pen or tongue, but devoted his long life to the blessing of his race.

The exact date of his death is not known; it was early in 1683, when about eighty-four

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

years of age, and he was buried with all the honors that the colony could show. In 1860 his dust was exhumed by one of his descendants and removed from the orchard, where it had reposed so long, to the North Burial Ground, Providence. Dr. A.J. Gordon, of Boston, a graduate of Brown University, says: 'While a student in that goodly city I saw the bones of Roger Williams disinterred, and, strange to relate, it was discovered that the tap-root of an apple-tree had struck down and followed the whole length of the stubborn Baptist's spinal column, appropriating and absorbing its substance till not a vestige of the vertebrae remained. And thus, that invincible backbone of Roger Williams, whom a critical Massachusetts statesman stigmatized as "contentiously conscientious," was "spread throughout the world dispersed" in the fruit of the tree that grew above his grave. Blessed are they who are so fortunate as to have their theology enriched by such strong phosphites.' The late Dr. W.R. Williams, alluding to the heavy burden of fruit which Roger Williams's apple-tree had produced year by year and scattered by its seed, says of the 'curious fidelity' of this root in following the outline of the skeleton: 'It was as if to say, that the righteous are fruitful of good even in the dust of their moldering. And over a broad republic – every day widening its territory and the sweep of its influence, political, literary and religious – it seems today impossible to say how much of the national order and happiness is traceable to the memory and example of the man there entombed; is the fruitage, under God's benediction, of the sufferings and sacrifices of the weary pilgrim and exile who there found repose.'

The works of Roger Williams have been collected and reprinted in six quarto volumes, under the care of the Narragansett Club, making about 2,000 pages. Of these Professor Tyler says:

'Roger Williams, never in any thing addicted to concealments, has put himself, without reserve, into his writings. There he still remains. There, if anywhere, we may get well acquainted with him. Searching for him along the two thousand printed pages upon which he has stamped his own portrait, we seem to see a very human and fallible man, with a large head, a warm heart, a healthy body, an eloquent and imprudent tongue; not a symmetrical person, poised, cool, accurate, circumspect; a man very anxious to be genuine and to get at the truth, but impatient of slow methods, trusting gallantly to his own intuitions, easily deluded by his own hopes; an imaginative, sympathetic, affluent, impulsive man; an optimist; his master-passion benevolence,...lovely in his carriage,...of a hearty and sociable turn,...in truth a clubbable person; a man whose dignity would not have petrified us, nor his saintliness have given us a chill...from early manhood even down to late old age,...in New England a mighty and benignant form, always pleading for some magnanimous idea, some tender charity, the rectification of some wrong, the exercise of some sort of forbearance toward men's bodies or souls.'

As to his person, no genuine portrait of him is known to exist, or it would have appeared in this volume. Some years ago one was supposed to have been found, but Dr. Guild, the librarian of Brown University, and others pronounce it spurious. A monument, twenty-seven feet high, crowned by a statue seven and a half feet in height, was erected to his memory in 1877 in Roger Williams Park, Providence, but as a likeness of the great apostle it is purely ideal.

Most sacredly has Rhode Island guarded the hallowed trust committed to her charge, for no man has ever been persecuted in that sovereignty for his religious opinions and practices from its first settlement in 1636. Williams obtained the first charter in 1643-44, and the first body of laws was drawn under it in 1647. Under the town legislation of the several

The American Baptists

towns, which had sprung up before the charter was granted, absolute religious liberty was secured to each inhabitant; in 1647, at the close of the civil enactments made under this charter, these words were added: 'And otherwise than this what is herein, forbidden, all men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God. And let the lambs of the Most High walk in this colony without molestation in the name of Jehovah their God forever.' At the first, all the functions of government were exercised by the whole body of citizens in town-meeting. Two deputies were chosen to preserve the peace, call the meeting and execute its decisions.

The same spirit animated the two colonies of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. In fact, the first declaration of democracy formulated in America dates from the island of Rhode Island, March 16, 1641, when

'It was ordered and unanimously agreed upon, that the government which this body politic doth attend unto in this island and the jurisdiction thereof, in favor of our prince, is a DEMOCRACY, or popular government; that is to say, it is in the power of the body of freemen, orderly assembled, or major part of them, to make or constitute just laws, by which they will be regulated, and to depute from among themselves such ministers as shall see them faithfully executed between man and man.' And the following acts secured religious liberty there: 'It was further ordered, by the authority of this present Court, that none be accounted a delinquent for doctrine, provided, it be not directly repugnant to the government or laws established.' On September, 1641, it was ordered, 'That the law of the last Court, made concerning liberty of conscience in point of doctrine, be perpetuated.' It was decreed at Providence in 1647 that since 'Our charter gives us power to govern ourselves, and such other as come among us; and by such a form of civil government as by the voluntary consent, etc., shall be found most suitable to our estate and

condition; It is agreed by this present Assembly thus incorporate, and by this present act declared, that the form of government established in Providence Plantations is DEMOCRATICAL; that is to say, a government held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants.'

At Providence, May, 1638, a citizen who had molested the rights of his wife's conscience by refusing to let her attend public worship, when she desired to do so, was disfranchised, in these words: 'Joshua Verin, for breach of covenant in restraining liberty of conscience, shall be withheld the liberty of voting, till he declare the contrary.' Arnold, another citizen, attempted to hoodwink the freemen of the plantation, by pretending that Verin restrained her 'out of the free exercise of his conscience' as her husband. But the freemen saw through the wool with which he attempted to veil their eyes. Williams states the case thus to Winthrop:

'Sir, we have been long afflicted by a young man, boisterous and desperate, Philip Verin's son, of Salem, who, as he hath refused to hear the word with us (which we molested him not for) this twelve month, so because he could not draw his wife, a gracious and modest woman, to the same ungodliness with him, he hath trodden her underfoot tyrannically and brutishly; which she and we long bearing, though with his furious blows she went in danger of life, at last the major vote of us discard him from our civil freedom, or disfranchise, etc.: he will have justice, as he clamors, in other courts, etc.'

This blustering wife-beater had come from Salem, and because he could not thrash his wife at pleasure, and continue to put her life 'in danger,' and tread 'her underfoot tyrannically and brutishly' in deference to his own sweetly 'seared' conscience, he was 'dissatisfied with his position' and 'returned to Salem.' Possibly, as Hooker said to Shephard, he concluded that that 'coast was most meet for his opinion and

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

practice,' as well as for his sort of conscience. So, because conscientious wife-whipping was not popular at Providence, Joshua shook off the dust of his feet against that plantation, and being mindful of the country from whence he came out, its freemen, as it seems, gave him opportunity to return thither, fists, conscience and all.

In 1745 there was printed a revision or compilation of all the laws of the colony since its first charter, which was called the 'Revision of 1745.' This makes reference to a law said to have been passed in 1663-64 to the effect, that 'All men professing Christianity, and of competent estates and civil conversation (Roman Catholics only excepted), shall be admitted freemen, or may choose or be chosen colonial officers.' This alleged act is referred to by Chalmers, an English author, in his 'Political Annals,' London (1780). Judge Samuel Eddy, a man of great learning and scrupulous veracity, who was Secretary of State in Rhode Island from 1797 to 1819, and had all the records at command, says that he carefully investigated all the laws of the colony from the first Charter (1643-44) to 1719, and that 'there is not a word on record of the act referred to by Chalmers' and contained in the 'Revision of 1745' prior to that year. This he shows conclusively,

1. By citing the First Charter, in which liberty is granted the colonists to make their own laws, and the consequent passage in 1647 of a body of colonial laws, providing that 'All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God.' 2. He cites the Second Charter (1663), which provides that 'No person within said colony at any time hereafter shall be any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any differences in opinion in matters of religion.' That they may 'freely and fully have and enjoy their own judgments and consciences in matters of religious concernments.' 3. He

cites an expression of the Assembly, of May, 1665 that 'It hath been a principle held forth and maintained in this colony from the beginning thereof, so it is much in their hearts to procure the same liberty to all persons within this colony forever as to the worship of God therein.' A military law, passed May, 1677, is to the same effect. 4. In 1680, the Assembly said: 'We leave every man to walk as God shall persuade their hearts and do actively and passively yield obedience to the civil magistrate.'

Judge Eddy says: 'Thus you have positive and indubitable evidence that the law excluding Roman Catholics from the privileges of freemen was not passed in 1663-64, but that at that time and long after they were entitled to all the privileges of other citizens.' He adds, that his search was had 'with a particular view to this law excluding Roman Catholics from the privileges of freemen, and can find nothing that has any reference to it, nor any thing that gives any preference or privileges to men of one set of religious opinions over those of another till the Revision of 1745.' Roger Williams was a member of the Upper House, 1664, 1670-71, and of the Lower House in 1667, and died 1683. Eddy says: 'That such a law could have been passed in the life-time of the first settlers is hardly credible,' and that the statement in the Revision of 1745 is plainly an error.

It was twenty years after the appointment of the Committee on Revision that their report was printed, 1745, there being no printing-press in the colony till that year, and no newspaper till 1758. The existence of this law against Catholics in 1745 does not necessarily show that the law was passed at that time, but Eddy does show that it must have been enacted between 1719 and 1745, the Revision being the only record of the law. Exactly in what year it passed does not anywhere appear, but it existed as an unrepealed statute in 1745, amongst the

laws then officially printed by the colony, while Eddy proves that the date 1663-64 is plainly a mistake. The universal reputation of Rhode Island in the neighboring colonies, for the largest freedom in religion, is well sustained by these laws, which completely deny that any were persecuted therefor, much less Roman Catholics. Cotton Mather says, that there were no Roman Catholics in the colony in 1695, and Chalmers says the same of 1680. Seeing, then, that this anticatholic, parenthetic clause is not to be found in any manuscript law of the colony either before 1663-64, or after, and so long as no date can be fixed upon for its enactment, the fair presumption follows that it is an interpolation. This presumption is strengthened also by the additional facts, that although 'all men' had from the founding of the colony walked 'as their consciences persuade' them, yet, for twenty-seven years no Roman Catholic had come to the colony, or been notified that he could not come, nor has any Catholic ever been refused his full rights there to this day. The law of May 19th, 1647, made express provision for the liberty of all to walk unmolested in the name of his God, and yet, according to Chalmers, it was thirty-three years after that enactment, namely, in 1680, before any Catholic availed himself of this freedom. So, then, there was nothing in 1663-64 to call for the legislative insertion of such a clause changing the law from what it had been since the founding of the colony. The general supposition of the best historians of Rhode Island is, that it was introduced into a mixed and irregular digest of the laws of that colony, which appeared in England, by some timid person, who feared that the English Protestants would complain that Rhode Island gave too much liberty to Catholics, and so that her charter would be revoked, hence, he ventured to make the interpolation to save difficulty. In 1676 England was thrown into an intense

excitement by the general belief in a 'Popish plot' for the assassination of William III. The popular idea was that the Protestants were to be given over to a British St. Bartholomew; the Duke of York, a bigoted Catholic, was to usurp the throne; and all were ready for a bloody civil war. Some friend of Rhode Island may have shared in this panic, but there is not the slightest evidence that its legislators did, especially as they repealed the smuggled clause on discovery. The following appears as the law in 1798:

'Whereas a principal object of our venerable ancestors, in their migration to this country and settlement in this State, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil State may stand and be best maintained with a full liberty in religious concerns: Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, and by the authority thereof it is enacted, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever, nor shall he be enforced, restrained or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.'

This whole legal presentation is found in Robert Walsh's 'Appeal,' an octavo, published in Philadelphia, 1819, pp. 429-435.

Religious liberty for Jews in Rhode Island must be referred to here. At the opening of the seventeenth century, Holland was the only country where they enjoyed this blessing. Their largest European congregation was in Amsterdam, also their Talmud Tora, or school for Hebrew youth. Leonard Busher made the first plea for their liberty in England, in 1614, saying: 'The king and Parliament may please to permit all Christians, yea, Jews, Turks and pagans, so long as they are peaceable and no

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

malefactors.' A second plea was made by Roger Williams, in three passages of his 'Bloody Tenet,' published in London, 1644, one of which reads thus, and the others are of the same tenor: 'It is the will and command of God, that since the coming of his Son, the Lord Jesus, a permission of the most paganish, Jewish, Turkish or antichristian consciences and worships, be granted to men in all nations and all countries. That civil States with their officers of justice are not governors or defenders of the spiritual and Christian state and worship.' Drs. Featley, Baillie and others charged him with the most shocking blasphemy for this doctrine, and popular indignation was so savage that his book was burned. Samuel Richardson demands, in his work on the 'Necessity of Toleration,' published 1647 (p. 270): 'Whether the priests were not the cause of the burning of the book entitled "The Bloody Tenet," because it was against persecution? And whether their consciences would not have dispensed with the burning of the author of it?' Baillie himself said: 'Liberty of conscience, and toleration of all or any religion, is so prodigious an impiety, that this religious Parliament cannot but abhor the very naming of it. Whatever may be the opinions of John Goodwin, Mr. Williams and some of that stamp,...yet Mr. Burroughs explodes that abomination.'

The Jews had been driven from England in 1290, and after banishment for 364 years, they petitioned Cromwell and Parliament for permission to return, that they might trade in the realm and follow their religion. What influence Williams's book had exerted in favor of their return does not appear, but about six years after its publication their request was granted, and in 1665 they built their first synagogue in King Street, London. This controversy was soon transferred to America. Edward Winslow wrote to Winthrop, under date of November 24th, 1645, saying that at a late

session of the Legislature they had had a violent contest over the proposition: 'To allow and maintain full and free toleration of religion to all men that would preserve the civil peace, and submit unto government, and there was no limitation or exception against Turk, Jew, Papist, Arian, Socinian, Nicholayton, Familist, or any other, etc.' Mr. Winslow says that the mover submitted it to him, and 'having read it, I told him I utterly abhorred it as such as would make us odious to all Christian commonweals... But our governor and divers of us having expressed that sad consequences would follow, especially myself and Mr. Prence, yet, notwithstanding, it was required according to order to be voted. But the governor would not suffer it to come to vote, as being that indeed would eat out the power of godliness, etc...By this you may see that all the troubles of New England are not at the Massachusetts. The Lord in mercy look upon us and allay this spirit of division that is creeping in amongst us.' In direct opposition to this teaching and in harmony with the teaching of Roger Williams, the General Assembly of Rhode Island decreed, in 1647, three years after his publication of the 'Bloody Tenet,' and three years before England permitted Jews to return to the realm, that in this colony, 'ALL men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God.' In 1649 Edward Winslow published his 'Danger of Tolerating Levelers in a Civil State,' and in 1652 Roger Williams published his letter to Endicott, Governor of Massachusetts, with an Appendix addressed to four classes of the clergy, 'Popish, Prelatical, Presbyterian and Independent,' in which he says of those who refuse to be Christians: 'Yea, if they refuse, deny, oppose the doctrine of Jesus Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, why should you call for fire from heaven, which suits not with Jesus Christ, his Spirit and ends. Why should you compel them to come in, with any

other sword but that of the Spirit of God?"

At that time there was no organized Jewish congregation in Great Britain or any of her American Colonies. As early as 1650 a few Portuguese Jews from Holland had found their way to New York against the protest of Peter Stuyvesant, made to the West India Company at Amsterdam in 1654; but as the Jews were large stockholders in that company, they insisted on certain privileges being granted to their co-religionists. The citizens of New Amsterdam would not train with them in the Burgher Company, and the Jews were exempted from military duty on condition of paying sixty-five stivers per month. In 1655 a special Act permitted them to live and trade there, provided that they would support their own poor. On the 27th of July, 1655, they petitioned for a burying ground, but were refused on the pretext that they had 'no need of it yet;' one of their number dying, on the 14th of February, 1656, they were granted a lot 'for a, place of interment,' outside the city. On the 13th of March, 1656, Stuyvesant, director of the Company, was instructed that they should enjoy the same civil and political privileges that they enjoyed in Holland, but that 'they should not presume to exercise religious worship in synagogues or meetings, and when they requested that privilege,' he was 'to refer the petition to his superiors.' Still they were not allowed 'to exercise any handicraft or to keep any open retail store,' but they were at liberty to 'exercise their religious worship in all quietness within their houses. To which end they will, doubtless, seek to build their dwellings together in a more convenient place, on the one or the other side of New Amsterdam.' In the spring of 1657 they were admitted to the right of citizenship, but the learned Rabbi Lyons, possibly the highest Hebrew authority on the subject, says in his 'Jewish Calendar' (page 160), that their 'first minutes of congregational affairs, written in

Spanish and English, are dated Tishree 20th, 5489-1728,' and that these refer to 'rules and regulations adopted, 5466-1706, twenty years previous.' Their first synagogue was not dedicated 'till 1696, when Samuel Brown was their rabbi.

On the same high authority we find that the Jewish congregation, Teshuat Israel, was organized in Newport, Rhode island, in 1658, under the broad provision of 1647, that 'ALL MEN,' in that Colony 'may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God.' Such liberty they had not elsewhere on this globe at that time, Holland not excepted, for even there they were forbidden to 'speak or to write disparagingly of the Christian religion; to make converts to their own faith; to exercise any handicraft or carry on retail trade; and marriages between Christians and Jews were strictly prohibited.' They labored under none of these restrictions in Rhode Island, but in all these respects stood upon a perfect equality with Baptists, Quakers and other religionists, and that congregation has remained undisturbed to this day, a period of two hundred and twenty-eight years, and is but fourteen years younger than the first Baptist Church of that city. Arnold says that they did much to build up the commercial interests of Newport. Some of them rose in public favor for their services to the State, and on August 20th, 1750, 'Moses Lopez, of Newport, was excused at his own request from all other civil duties, on account of his gratuitous services to the government in translating Spanish documents.' This indicates that he had done all the civil duties of a freeman up to that time. By the year 1763, the little Jewish congregation at Newport had increased to sixty families, their necessities demanding the erection of a synagogue, which they began to build in 1762, and which their rabbi, Isaac Touro, dedicated to Jehovah in 1763, with 'great pomp and ceremony.' This

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

large increase in their number was due chiefly to the great earthquake of 1755, the center of which was in Spain and Portugal; it swallowed up fifty thousand inhabitants of Lisbon alone. Many of the Jews, who fled for safety from more cruel foes than the yawning earth, came to Rhode Island, where their own brethren had worshiped God in peace and safety for one hundred and eight years. These facts entirely disprove the alleged fact that in 1663-64 Rhode Island passed a law restricting religious liberty to those 'professing Christianity.'

Some writers have fallen into singular confusion in treating of this subject, making Roger Williams and Rhode Island identical on the one hand, by holding them responsible for each other's acts and on the other by confounding the civil and religious liberties of that Colony as if they were one. A noted case cited under this groundless assumption is that of Aaron Lopez and Isaac Elizur. These two Hebrews petitioned the Superior Court of Rhode Island, at its March term, in 1762, for naturalization under an Act of Parliament, and were rejected on the ground, that to naturalize them would violate the spirit of the charter; that none could be made citizens but Christians; and that the Colony was too full of people already. The last of these reasons throws suspicion on the other two given for the decision, as it was simply ridiculous; yet it serves to show that the Court was moved by other considerations than those of guarding high chartered rights. But, whatever its motive might have been, the question before it was a purely civil question involving only the naturalization of a foreigner, and not his right to religious liberty under the laws of Rhode Island. There are millions of people in the United States today who enjoy all the religious rights of its native-born citizens, but not being citizens they seek naturalization, at the courts; which, as in the case of Chinamen, is often denied. So these two men

were, without doubt, members of the Jewish congregation which at that moment was building a synagogue under the protection of Rhode Island law, and now they wished to add citizenship to religious right. Mr. Charles Deane has written with a discriminating pen on this point. He complains of a misapprehension on this question of refusing to admit to the franchise those who were not Christians, and says:

'The charter of Rhode Island declared that no one should be "molested"...or called in question for any difference of opinion in matters of religion. The law in question does not relate to religious liberty, but to the franchise. Rhode Island has always granted liberty to persons of every religious opinion, but has placed a hedge about the franchise; and this clause does it. Was it not natural for the founders of Rhode Island to keep the government in the hands of its friends, while working out their experiment, rather than to put it into the hands of the enemies of religious liberty? How many ship-loads of Roman Catholics would it have taken to swamp the little Colony in the days of its weakness?'

The 'clause' to which he refers is the so-called 'Catholic exclusion,' which has already been considered, but this distinction between the civil and religious questions involved here is precisely as clear in the case of the Jews as of the Catholics.

Arnold well says:

'The right to be admitted a freeman, or even to be naturalized, was purely a civil one, dependent upon the view that the town councils might take of the merits of each individual case. The right to reject was absolute,' as well in the case of a Baptist as a Jew. 'Freemen,' he continues, 'were admitted into the Colony by the Assembly, to whom the application should have been made, if freemanship was what these Jews wanted...Naturalization was granted properly

The American Baptists

by the Courts, but usually by the Assembly, who exercised judicial prerogatives in this matter as in many others...The decision in the case of Lopez appears to be irregular in every respect. It subverts an Act of Parliament, violates the spirit of the charter, enunciates principles never acted upon in the Colony, and finally dismisses the case on a false issue...The reasons assigned for the rejection, in the decree above given, were false...If that had been the fundamental law from the beginning, no one could have been admitted a freeman who was not a Christian; but Jews were admitted to freemanship again and again by the Assembly...The charter of Rhode Island guaranteed, and the action of the Colony uniformly secured, to all people perfect religious freedom. It did not confer civil privileges as a part of that right upon any one, such only were entitled to those whom the freemen saw fit to admit.'

At the time that the Superior Court gave this decision, Rhode Island was passing through a scene of high political excitement, and Arnold attributes its decision to 'the strife then existing between Chief-Justice Ward and Governor Hopkins...For many years prior to that time there was scarcely a session of the Assembly, when one or more cases of the kind (naturalization) did not occur, in which the names and nationalities of the parties show them to be either Roman Catholics or Jews.' Amongst these, he mentions the case of Stephen Decatur (1753), a Genoese, the father of the celebrated Commodore, and that of Lucerna, a Portuguese Jew, in 1761.

No class of people more earnestly and gratefully recognize Roger Williams as the apostle of their liberties than do the American Jews. One of their ablest writers says in a recent

work:

'The earliest champion of religious freedom, or "soul liberty," as he designated that most precious jewel of all liberties, was Roger Williams...To him rightfully belongs the immortal fame of having been the first person in modern times to assert and maintain in its fullest plenitude the absolute right of every man to "a full liberty in religious concerns," and to found a State wherein this doctrine was the key-stone of its organic laws...Roger Williams, the first pure type of an American freeman, proclaimed the laws of civil and religious liberty, that "the people were the origin of all free power in government," that God has given to men no power over conscience, nor can men grant this power to each other; that the regulation of the conscience is not one of the purposes for which men combine in civil society. For uttering such heresies; this great founder of our liberties was banished out of the jurisdiction of the Puritans in America...In grateful remembrance of God's merciful providence to him in his distress, he gave to it (the new town) the name of Providence. "I desired," said he, "it might be a shelter for persons distressed for conscience."...The infant community at Providence at once set about to frame laws for government, in strict accord with the spirit of the settlement. "Masters of families incorporated together into a township, and such others as they shall admit into the same, only in civil things." This simple instrument is the earliest constitution of government whereof we have any record, which not only tolerated all religions, but recognized as a right, absolute liberty of conscience.'

Chapter 3 - Settlement of Rhode Island

The American Baptists

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

ROGER WILLIAMS, having adopted the old Baptist principle of absolute soul-liberty and given it practical effect in the civil provisions which he had devised, could not stop there. This deep moral truth carried with it certain logical outworkings concerning human duty as well as its rights, and as his doctrine could not stand alone in his thought, he was compelled to take another step forward. Relieved from all outside authority in matters of conscience, to which he had formerly submitted, he was now directly responsible to God for the correctness of his faith and practice, and by all that he had suffered he was bound to walk in an enlightened conscience. This compelled him to inquire what obedience God demanded of him personally, and threw him directly back upon his word as to his personal duty in the matter of baptism. While an infant he had been christened, but having now put himself under the supreme Headship of Christ, without the intervention of human authority, he found himself at a step on pure Baptist ground, and determined to be baptized on his own faith.

Williams with five others had settled Providence in June, 1636, and their numbers soon grew, so that in about three years there appear to have been about thirty families in the colony. In the main, the Christian portion of them had been Congregationalists, but in their trying position they seem to have been left unsettled religiously, especially regarding Church organization. Winthrop says that they met both on week-days and the Sabbath for the worship of God; but the first sign of a Church is found sometime previous to March, 1639, when Williams and eleven others were baptized, and a Baptist Church was formed under his lead. Hubbard tells us that he was baptized 'by one Holliman, then Mr. Williams re-baptized him and some ten more.' Ezekiel Holliman had been

a member of Williams's Church at Salem, which Church, March 12th, 1638, charged him with 'neglect of public worship, and for drawing many over to his persuasion.' For this he 'is referred to the elders, that they may endeavor to convince and bring him from his principle and practice.' [Felt, *Ecc. Hist.* I, p. 334] Through its pastor, Hugh Peters, the Salem Church wrote to the Dorchester Church July 1st, 1639, informing them that 'the great censure' had been passed upon 'Roger Williams and his wife, Thomas Olney and his wife, Stukley Westcot and his wife, Mary Holliman, with widow Reeves,' and that 'these wholly refused to hear the Church, denying it and all the Churches of the Bay to be the true Churches, and (except two) all are *re-baptized*.' [Felt, I, 379,380]

In the baptism of these twelve we find a case of peculiar necessity, such as that in which the validity of 'lay-baptism' has never been denied. Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome, all held that in cases of necessity 'laymen' should baptize and the Synod of Elvira so decreed. Mosheim writes: 'At first, all who were engaged in propagating Christianity, administered this rite; nor can it be called in question, that whoever persuaded any person to embrace Christianity, could baptize his own disciple.' [Ecc. Hist. I, pp. 105,106] Some, amongst whom we find Winthrop, have thought that Williams became a Baptist under the influence of a sister of Mrs. Hutchinson; others, that John Clarke, then of Aquidneck, was very likely the instrument of influencing him to this choice. But Clarke makes no reference in his writings to the baptism of his intimate friend, as he probably would have done had he led him to this step. So far as appears, there was not a Baptist minister in the colony at the time. Williams was an ordained minister in the English Episcopal Church and had been re-ordained at Salem, May, 1635, after the

Congregational order, so that no one could question his right to immerse on the ground of non-ordination. He has left no account of his baptism, and some have questioned whether he was immersed, a point that we may now examine.

Under date of March 16th, 1639, Felt says: 'Williams, as stated by Winthrop, was lately immersed;' [*Ecc. Hist.*, I, p. 402] and that he was immersed has never been questioned by any historian down from Winthrop to Bancroft, until recently. In 1879 this question was raised, but only then on the assumption that immersion was not practiced by the English Baptists until 1641, and so, that in America, Williams must have been 'affused' in March, 1639! Richard Scott, who was a Baptist with Williams at Providence, but who afterward became a Quaker, writing against Williams thirty-eight years afterward, says: 'I walked with him in the Baptists' way about three or four months,...in which time he broke from his society, and declared at large the ground and reason for it; that their baptism could not be right because it was not administered by an apostle. After that he set upon a way of seeking, with two or three of them that had dissented with him, by way of preaching and praying; and there he continued a year or two till two of the three left him...After his society and he in a Church way were parted, he then went to England.' [Appendix to Fox's *Fire-band Quenched*, p. 247] Here he gives no hint that 'the Baptists' way differed in any respect in 1639 from what it was when he wrote. Hooker's letter to Shepard, November 2d, 1640, shows clearly that immersion was practiced at Providence at that time. When speaking of Humphrey inviting Chauncey from Plymouth to Providence, on account of his immersionist notions, Hooker says: 'That coast is more meet for his opinion and practice.' And Coddington, Governor of Rhode Island, a determined enemy of Williams,

put this point unmistakably, thus: 'I have known him about fifty years; a mere weathercock, constant only in inconstancy...One time for water baptism, men and women must be plunged into the water, and then threw it all down again.' [Letter to Fox, 1677]

But Williams's own opinion of Scripture baptism, given in a letter to Winthrop, November 10th, 1649, should set this point at rest. Speaking of Clarke, the founder of the Baptist Church at Newport, he writes: 'At Seekonk a great many have lately concurred with Mr. Clarke and our Providence men about the point of a new baptism and the manner of dipping, and Mr. Clarke hath been there lately, and Mr. Lucar, and hath dipped them. I believe their practice comes nearer the first practice of our great founder, Jesus Christ, than other practices of religion do, and yet I have not satisfaction neither in the authority by which it is done, nor in the manner.' These words were written ten years after he repudiated his Providence baptism by Holliman, and after he had cast aside baptism altogether, both as to 'authority' and 'manner.' As to the legitimate use of the phrase 'new baptism' by him, its sense in this case would relate to an institution administered afresh to the candidates at Seekonk in addition to their infant baptism, and to the recent introduction of that practice on this continent, as contrary to the entire previous practice here, and not to the creation of a new rite, or the revival of an old one; for even in 1649 he thought it nearer the practice of Jesus Christ. There can be no doubt as to what these elders, Clarke and Lucar, did in administering baptism at Seekonk, for Clarke's Confession of Faith, found in the records of his Church (No. 32), says: 'I believe that the true baptism of the Gospel is a visible believer with his own consent to be baptized in common water, by dying, or, as it were, drowning, to hold forth death, burial and resurrection, by a messenger

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.' [Backus, I, 208] Williams says here, that 'our Providence men' 'concurred' with Clark and the converts at Seekonk, and gives no intimation that the Providence Baptists had ever differed from his own views concerning dipping as 'nearer the first practice of our great founder, Jesus Christ, than other practices of religion do.'

The hand of God appears to have led Roger Williams to plant the good seed of the kingdom in that colony, and then to step aside, lest any flesh should glory in his presence. In that day there was a very respectable class of men, both in England and the older colonies, nicknamed 'Seekers,' simply because they were earnest inquirers after truth; and, concluding that it was impossible to find it then on earth, they looked for its new manifestation from heaven. They sought a visible and apostolic line of purely spiritual character, something after the order of the late Edward Irving, and not finding this, they waited for a renewal of Apostles with special gifts of the Spirit to attest their credentials. When Williams withdrew from the Baptists he was classed with these. His theory of the apostolate seems to have been the cause of his withdrawal, and of his doubt concerning the validity of his baptism. A few years later, in his 'Bloody Tenet' and his 'Hireling Ministry,' he denied that a ministry existed which was capable of administering the ordinances, for in 'the rule of Antichrist the true ministry was lost, and he waited for its restoration, much after John Smyth's view, in a new order of succession. Of course he looked upon his baptism as defective, and withdrew from the Baptists. His was not an unusual case at that period.

Walter Cradock tells us, in 1648, of 'a man that was a member of a Church and, because he saw infants baptized and himself

was not, he broke off from them, and said that there was no Church, and all the streams did run for two months together on baptism; there was nothing talked of but that, and concluded the Anabaptists and all were Antichristian, and there was no Church nor any thing till we had Apostles again. As I told you, that any that hold that principle and follow it closely and rationally, they will infallibly come to Apostles, and miracles, and signs from heaven.' [*Gospel Liberty*, p. 144]

The withdrawal of Williams from the Baptists did not disrupt brotherly love between them to the end of his life, and he did not prize this brotherly fellowship lightly.

In reply to Fox, 1672, he says: 'After all my search and examinations and considerations, I do profess to believe that some come nearer to the first primitive Churches and the institutions and appointments of Jesus Christ than others; as in many respects, so in that gallant and heavenly and fundamental principle of the true matter of a Christian congregation, flock, or society; namely, actual believers, true disciples and converts, living stones, such as can give some account how the grace of God hath appeared unto them.'

It will be in order here to say a few words concerning the Church which he planted at Providence.

The advanced views of Williams in regard to the need of personal regeneration in a Christian and his utter rejection of infant baptism, views radically distinctive of Baptists both in his day and ours, and the direct opposite of those held by the standing order in the New England colonies of his time, show clearly the grounds of his baptism by Holliman. Of his personal regeneration he says: 'From my childhood, now above three-score years, the Father of Lights and Mercies touched my soul with a love to himself, to the only begotten, the true Lord Jesus, to his Holy Scriptures.' [*Address to the Quakers*, March 10, 1673]

The American Baptists

Three years after making this statement, he states to George Fox that a Gospel Church must be made up of such regenerate men, and calls them actual believers, true disciples and converts, living stones, such as can give some account how the grace of God hath appeared unto them and wrought that heavenly change in them.' This change he calls 'that gallant and heavenly and fundamental principle of the true matter of a Christian congregation, flock or society.' [*Reply to Fox*, 1676] And as these were the views which he held in 1675, thirty-six years after his own baptism, it is only fair to credit him with them at the time of his baptism. His tractate, 'Christenings make not Christians,' published in London, 1645, gives a full exposition of his radical views on this subject, in language so full and round as to make them worthy of the best teachers of Baptist theology in the present century. This rare book, which was supposed to be lost, but which has recently been found amongst the enormous accumulations of the British Museum and republished in Rider's *Rhode Island Historical Tracts*, must speak here. On page 5 he says:

'To be a Christian implies two things, to be a follower of that anointed One in all his offices, second to partake of his anointings.' On page 7 he deplores departure from the true kingdom of God as shown by the marks of a 'false conversion and a false constitution or framing of national Churches, in false ministries, the ministrations of baptism, Supper of the lord,' etc. He charges, on pages 10, 11, that false Christians had made amongst the heathen monstrous and 'most inhuman conversions, yea, ten thousands of the poor natives, sometimes by wiles and subtle devices, sometimes by force, compelling them to submit to that which they understood not, neither before nor after such their monstrous christening of them. Thirdly, for our New England parts, I can speak uprightly and confidently. I know it to have been easy for myself, long ere this, to have brought many

thousands of these natives, yea, the whole country, to a far greater antichristian conversion than ever was yet heard of in America. I have reported something in the chapter of their religion [in his Key] how readily I could have brought the whole country to have observed one day in seven; I add to have received a baptism (or washing), though it were in rivers (as the first Christians and the Lord Jesus himself did), to have come to a stated Church meeting, maintained priests and forms of prayer, and the whole form of antichristian worship in life and death.'

After repeating that he could so have converted the Indians, he asks:

'Why have I not brought them to such a conversion? I answer: Woe be to me, if I call light darkness, or darkness light; sweet bitter, or bitter sweet; woe to me, if I call that conversion unto God, which is, indeed, subversion of the souls of millions in Christendom, from one worship to another, and the profanation of the holy name of God, his holy Son and blessed ordinances...It is not a suit of crimson satin will make a dead man live; take off and change his crimson into white, he is dead still. Off with that, and shift him into cloth of gold, and from that to cloth of diamonds, he is but a dead man still. For it is not a form, nor the change of one form into another, a finer and a finer and yet more fine, that makes a man a convert — I mean such a convert as is acceptable to God in Jesus Christ according to the visible rule of his last will and testament. I speak not of hypocrites, which may but glitter, and be no solid gold, as Simon Magus, Judas, etc. But of a true external conversion [probably a misprint for eternal] I say, then, woe be to me! if intending to catch men, as the Lord Jesus said to Peter, I should pretend conversion, and the bringing of men, as mystical fish, into a Church estate, that is, a converted estate, and so build them up with ordinances as a converted Christian people, and yet afterward still pretend to catch them by an after conversion.'

On pages 17, 18, he thus more fully defines what he held repentance and conversion to be:

'First, it must be by the free proclaiming and preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins (Luke 14) by such messengers as can prove their lawful sending and commission from the Lord Jesus to make disciples out of all nations; and so to baptize or wash them, into the name or profession of the Holy Trinity. Matt. 28:19; Rom. 10:14,15. Secondly, such a conversion, so far as man's judgment can reach, which is fallible, as was the judgment of the first messengers, as in Simon Magus, etc., as in the turning of the whole man from the power of Satan unto God. Acts 16. Such a change, as if an old man became a new babe (John 4); yea, as amounts to God's new creation in the soul. Eph. 2:10.'

In view of the fact that Williams remained with the Baptists but three or four months, some have seriously doubted whether he formed a Church there after that order at all, and amongst these, at one time, was the thoughtful and accurate Callender; but he seems at last to have concluded otherwise. Scott's words appear to settle this point, for he not only says that he walked with Williams in the Baptists' way, but that Williams 'broke from his society, and declared at large his reasons for doing so;' that two or three 'dissented with him;' and that he parted with 'his society' 'in a Church way.' What became of 'his society' after he left it is not very clear. Cotton Mather says: 'Whereupon his Church dissolved themselves;' and Neal, that 'his Church hereupon crumbled to pieces.' [*Magnalia*, ii, 432; Neal's *Hist. Diss.*, p. 111] It is difficult to know how far the so-called 'Records' of the Providence Church may be relied upon, as we shall see, but they say that 'Mr. Holliman was chosen assistant to Mr. Williams;' and it is probable that upon this authority Professor Knowles says, in his 'Life of Williams,' that Holliman 'became a preacher,' and fostered the society [page 168]. Scott's account carries the implication throughout that

the main body held together as Baptists when Williams left them. Great blame has been thrown upon Roger Williams for leaving the 'society' in Providence, and his conduct can be accounted for in part by his preconceived notions of a succession in the ministry, as is indicated in the expression already quoted, from his pen: 'By such messengers as can prove their lawful sending and commission.' But this accounts for it only in part. We may suppose that the affairs of the colony demanded the greater part of his time and energies. And moreover, we are not without indications that he found it about as hard to get along with compeers in that 'society' as they found it to get along with him; for none of them were made of the most supple material in human nature, as their after contentions and divisions about psalm-singing, laying on of hands, and other things show. Also the following shows that he did not regard some of them as any more orthodox in some doctrinal matters than they needed to be. He says, in a letter to John Whipple, dated Providence, August 24th, 1669: 'I am sorry that you venture to play with the fire, and W. Wickenden is toasting himself in it, and my want of tongs to rake him out without burning my fingers, etc. You know who it is that counts you and us as fools for believing the Scriptures; namely, that there shall be any hell at all, or punishment for sin after this life. But I am content to be a fool with Jesus Christ, who tells us of an account for every idle word in the day of judgment.' This rather indicates that some of the Providence brethren were tinctured with 'new theology,' while Roger stood squarely with Christ Jesus on the doctrine of future retribution, and had his own trials with the rather peculiar people of that old First Church for fully half a century.

From this time on the early history of the Church becomes a perplexing confusion, from the absence of records; if any minutes were

kept they cannot be found. In fact, during the so-called King Philip's War, in 1676, most if not all the houses in Providence were destroyed by the Indians, and the records, if there were any, of course, perished in the flames. About a century ago Rev. John Stanford preached for a year to the First Baptist Church in Providence, and made an honest attempt to collect the most reliable information that he could command, and formulated a *Book of Records*. Stanford's original manuscript of twenty pages folio has been preserved in the archives of the society, and also copied into the first volume of the Church records, which begin only in April, 1775. His history of the Church was published by Rippon in the 'Baptist Annual Register' for 1801-2. The doctor possessed unusual ability, and was not supposed to misrepresent in the slightest degree; but it was impossible for him to construct a reliable history without authentic material. All that he had was tradition and a few fragments, and he complains thus of his scanty supply: 'No attention to this necessary article has been paid;' and he further says that he attempted this collection 'under almost every discouraging circumstance.' After doing the best that he could, his supposed facts are so fragmentary as to leave long gaps unfilled; with their value so impaired that few careful writers feel at liberty to follow them entirely. Then they contain some few contradictions which the doctor was not able to explain, and which perplex all calm investigators; for example, they state that Williams was pastor of the Church for four years instead of four months; that it is not known when Thomas Olney was baptized or ordained, and that he came to Providence in 1654; whereas, in another place, they state that he was in the canoe with Williams when the Indians saluted him with 'What cheer?' and his name always appears in the list of members baptized by Williams, and amongst the thirteen original proprietors of

Providence. Professor Knowles complains of these errors; also Dr. Caldwell, a most candid and careful writer, says in his history of this Church, that this record 'contains many errors, which have been repeated by later writers, and sometimes as if they had the authority of original records.' Of the above contradictions he remarks: 'Mr. Stanford, in the Records, confounding Mr. Olney with his son, makes the following statement, which is an almost unaccountable mixture of errors.'

Where such serious defects abound in any records, it is clear that little firm reliance can be placed upon their testimony, and this without reflection on the compiler, who stated only what he found, and attempted no manufacture of facts to complete his story. We are obliged, therefore, to consult side lights and outside testimony, and take it for what it is worth, according to the means of information enjoyed by contemporaneous and immediately succeeding witnesses. These are not numerous in this case, nor are they very satisfactory, because their testimony does not always agree, nor had they equal means of knowing whereof they spoke. Hence several different theories have been put forth on the subject, in the friendly discussions of those who have cherished them, and so far without a solution of the difficulties.

In 1850 Rev. Samuel Adlam, then pastor of the First Church at Newport, wrote a pamphlet in which he attempted to show that if Roger Williams established a Church, and it did not fall to pieces after he withdrew from it, that his successor was Thomas Olney, Sr.; and that, in 1652-53, the Church divided on the subject of laying on of hands. Then that Wickenden went out with the new body, while Olney remained with the old body, which he continued to serve as pastor until his death, in 1682, after which that Church existed until 1715, when it died; and so that the present Church at Providence

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

dates back only to 1652-53. He founds this claim on the statement of John Comer, who left a diary in manuscript, and, writing about 1726-31, said: 'Mr. William Vaughn finding a number of Baptists in the town of Providence, lately joined together in special Church covenant, in the faith and practice, under the inspection of Mr. Wiggington [Wickenden], being heretofore members of the Church under Mr. Thomas Olney, of that town, he, that is, Mr. William Vaughn, went thither in the month of October, 1652, and submitted thereto (the laying on of hands), whereupon he returned to Newport, accompanied with Mr. William Wiggington and Mr. Gregory Dexter.'

For the above reason, Comer believed that the Newport and not the Providence Church was the first in what is now Rhode Island, and the first in America. Backus, who wrote in 1777, and Staples, in his 'Annals of Providence' (1843), both accept Comer's statement in relation to Olney as correct, Backus stating that Thomas Olney; Sr., 'was next to Mr. Williams in the pastoral office, and continued so to his death, over that part of the Church who were called Five Principle Baptists, in distinction from those who parted from their brethren about the year 1653, under the leading of elder Wickenden, holding to the laying on of hands upon every Church member.' This he repeats, and adds that when Williams 'put a stop to his further travel with' the First Church in Providence, 'Thomas Olney was their next minister,' after which he laments that darkness fell 'over their affairs.' [*Hist. Baptists*, I, p. 405; ii, pp. 490,491,285, Weston's ed.] Comer's testimony carried great weight with these authors, and justly; for he was a most painstaking man, possessing a clear and strong mind under high culture, ranking with the first men of his day. He was born in Boston, was nephew to Rev. Elisha Callender, pastor of the First Baptist Church there, and was baptized by

him in 1725. His parents had been Presbyterians, but on reading Stennett's reply to Russell, became Baptists. They educated their son at Yale, and he was chosen colleague to Peckham at Newport. Morgan Edwards says of him: 'He was curious in making minutes of very remarkable events, which swelled at last into two volumes...To this manuscript am I beholden for many chronologies and facts in this my third volume. He had conceived a design of writing a history of the American Baptists, but death broke his purpose at the age of thirty years, and left that for others to execute.' [*Materials for Hist. of R.I. Baptists*] This manuscript is now in possession of the Rhode Island Historical Society at Providence, and in writing it he gathered many facts from Samuel Hubbard and Edward Smith, both contemporary with the events which they related to him.

Those who do not accept the positions taken by Comer in this matter, and they constitute the great majority, claim that Rev. Chad Brown was the immediate pastoral successor of Williams; that when the division took place, in 1652-53, it was Olney who went out from the old Church with a new interest, and not Wickenden; that the Olney interest ceased to exist in 1715, and so, that the present First Church at Providence is the veritable Church which Williams formed in 1639. All admit that there was a division in the Church in 1652-53, but it seems impossible on present evidence to determine fully which was the seceding party. John Callender, another nephew of Elisha Callender, born 1706, graduated at Harvard, and settled as successor to Peckham at Newport, a man of wonderful attainments and accuracy, preached a great Historical Sermon in 1738 on 'The History of Rhode Island' covering its first century, which document has become standard authority; he states the case with the widest difference from Comer. He says:

'About the year 1653 there was a division in the Baptist Church at Providence about the rite of 'laying on of hands, which some pleaded for as essentially necessary to Church communion, and the others would leave indifferent. Hereupon they walked in two Churches, one under Mr. C. Brown, Wickenden, etc., the other under Mr. Thomas Olney, but laying on of hands at length generally prevailed.' On page 61, in the first edition of his sermon, he has this foot-note: 'This last continued till about twenty years since, when, becoming destitute of an elder, the members united with other Churches.'

Stephen Hopkins, in his 'History of Providence,' published in 1765, says, with both Comer and Callender before him:

'The first Church formed at Providence by Mr. Williams and others seems to have been on the model of the Congregational Churches in the other New England colonies. But it did not continue long in this form; for most of its members very soon embraced the principles and practices of the Baptists, and some time earlier than 1639 gathered and formed a Church at Providence of that society...This first Church of Baptists at Providence hath from the beginning kept itself in repute, and maintained its discipline, so as to avoid scandal, or schism, to this day; hath always been, and still is, a numerous congregation, and in which I have with pleasure observed very lately sundry descendants from each of the above-mentioned founders, except Holliman.' [*Providence Gazette*, 1765]

When Williams published his 'Bloody Tenet' in 1643-44, he held the doctrine of laying on of hands, for he says therein:

'Concerning baptism and laying on of hands, God's people will be found to be ignorant for many hundred years, and I cannot yet see it proved that light is risen, I mean the light of the first institution, in practice.'

He repeats the same sentiment in the 'Bloody Tenet, yet More Bloody,' 1652, and in

his 'Hireling Ministry,' 1652 [page 21]. This throws a ray of light upon the statement of Morgan Edwards, made in 1770:

'At first laying on of hands was held in a lax manner, so that they who had no faith in the rite were received without it, and such (saith Joseph Jenks) was the opinion of the Baptists in the first constitution of their Churches throughout this colony.' Again he says: 'Some divisions have taken place in this Church. The first was about the year 1654, on account of laying on of hands. Some were for banishing it entirely, among which Rev. Thomas Olney was the chief, who, with a few more withdrew and formed themselves into a distinct Church, distinguished by the name of Five Point Baptists, and the first of the name in the province; it continued in being to 1715, when Mr. Olney resigned the care of it, and soon after it ceased to exist.'

Mr. Olney, to whom Edwards refers as having resigned in 1715, could not have been the Rev. Thomas Olney who was one of the constituent members of the Church, and an assistant to Rev. Chad Brown. He died in 1682. His son, Thomas Olney, Jr., who is said also to have been an elder, died in 1722, at the advanced age of ninety-one. He was the town clerk until his death.

It seems clear from the statements of the most reliable historians that the first warm contention on the subject at Providence was between Wickenden and Olney, as to whether the point of being 'under hands' should be made a test of fellowship; that Olney went out, that Wickenden and Brown remained with the old Church, and that in that body, according to Callender, laying on of hands prevailed, and held its own till the days of Manning, when it ceased to be a test of membership, and gradually died out. The absence of records and contradictory statements from various sources, as to a succession of pastors until the coming of Dr. Manning, render it next to impossible to

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

follow a regular thread here, and the tangle is made worse by the statements of all, that in its early history the Church had three or four elders at once. Dr. Barrows says, of the first Newport Church, that it had elders 'besides a pastor,' and mentions three by name; and Dr. Caldwell says, that the Providence Church had 'two or three elders' at the same time. At the time of the division, 1652-53, there were four elders in this Church – Brown, Wickenden, Olney and Dexter. From Williams onward they were a glorious body of men. Some of them were Five and some Six Principle men; but there was not one Seventh Principle Baptist amongst them, who held to the 'five barley loaves and two small fishes.' For two generations they served the Church without salaries, a practice which must have ruined it without special grace. Their course in this direction induced Morgan Edwards to say: 'The ministry of this Church has been a very expensive one to the ministers, and a very cheap one to the Church.'

There is abundant cause for gratitude That Dr. Manning found his way to Providence as pastor in 1771. From that day it began to write a new history, but not without a struggle. He came first as a visitor and was invited to preach. But,

'Being Communion day, Mr. Winsor invited Mr. Manning to partake with them, which the president cordially accepted. After this several members were dissatisfied with Mr. Manning's partaking of the Lord's Supper with them; but at a Church meeting, appointed for the purpose, Mr. Manning was admitted to communion by vote of the Church. Notwithstanding this, some of the members remained dissatisfied at the privilege of transient communion being allowed Mr. Manning; whereupon another meeting was called previous to the next communion day, in order to reconcile the difficulty. At said meeting Mr. Manning was confirmed in his privilege by a much larger majority. At the next Church meeting Mr. Winsor appeared

with an unusual number of members from the country, and moved to have Mr. Manning displaced, but to no purpose. The ostensible reason of Mr. Winsor and of those with him for objecting against President Manning was, that he did not make imposition of hands a bar to communion, though he himself had received it, and administered it to those who desired it. Mr. Winsor and the Church knew. Mr. Manning's sentiments and practice for more than six years at Warren, those, therefore, who were well-informed attributed the opposition to the president's holding to singing in public worship, which was highly disgusting to Mr. Winsor. The difficulty increasing, it was resolved to refer the business to the next Association at Swansea. But when the case was presented, the Association, after a full hearing on both sides, agreed that they had no right to determine, and that the Church must act for themselves. The next Church meeting, which was in October, was uncommonly full. All matters relative to the president were fully debated, and by a much larger majority were determined in his favor. It was then agreed all should sit down at the Lord's Table the next Sabbath, which was accordingly done. But at the subsequent communion season, Mr. Winsor declined administering the ordinance, assigning for a reason, that a number of the brethren were dissatisfied. April 18, 1771, being Church meeting, Mr. Winsor appeared and produced a paper, signed by a number of members living out of town, dated Jonston, February 27. 1771. These parties withdrew on the issue, and formed a Six Principle Church.' [Providence Church Records]

On June 10th, 1771, the first Church sent to Swansea, inviting elders Job and Russel Mason to come and break bread to them after Samuel Winsor had left them to form a new Church. They replied, June 28th: 'Whereas, you have sent a request for one of us to break bread among you, we laid your request before our Church meeting; and there being but few present, and we not being able to know what the event of such a proceeding might be at this time, think it not expedient for us to come and

break bread with you' [Providence Church Records]. Before Manning accepted the pastorate permanently, the Church appointed him to break bread, and he acted as pastor *pro tem*. After the Church got through with all its quiddities and contentions, and came to labor earnestly for the salvation of men, the Holy Spirit was graciously outpoured upon it, and its prosperity became marked. In 1774 a young man named Biggilo was accidentally killed in Providence, and his death stirred the whole city. Tamer Clemons and Venus Arnold, two colored women, gave themselves to Christ, were converted and baptized; and the record says, 'The sacred flame of the Gospel began to spread. In fifteen months one hundred and four confessed the power of the Spirit of Christ, in the conversion of their souls, and entered the gates of Zion with joy.' They had no meeting-house for nearly sixty years, but met in groves or private houses, till noble elder Tillinghast built one, at his own expense, in 1700. Under the ministry of Dr. Manning, this, however ceased to meet their necessities, and in 1774 the present beautiful edifice was erected at a cost of £7,000, and dedicated to God on May 28th, 1775. Our fathers delighted greatly in 'its tall steeple, 196 feet in height, and in their new bell, which weighed 2,515 pounds, bearing this motto:

'For freedom of conscience, the town was first planted;
Persuasion, not force, was used by the people;
This church is the eldest, and has not recanted,
Enjoying and granting bell, temple, and steeple.'

Mind you, reader, this was one year before the clang of that grand old sister bell at Philadelphia which rang in our independence. But, alas for the vanity of noisy metal, the Baptist bell split its sides in 1787, and that at Independence Hall followed its example, since

which time the Providence people have kept their best bell in the pulpit, without a crack, from Manning to T. Edwin Crown, not the son of Chad, but his last worthy successor. Few bodies on earth have been honored with such a line of pastors for two and a half centuries, and few Churches have been so faithful to the great, first principles of the Gospel, without wavering for an hour. These she has maintained, too, without any written creed or human declaration of faith, standing firmly on the text and spirit of the Bible, as her only rule of faith and practice; notwithstanding that for a time her organization was followed by a set of crude notions and practices which do not characterize the Baptists of today, and which do not entitle her founders to canonization by any means. Taking Roger's Romish quiddity about apostolic succession and his thesis about some other things into account, they were a fair match for each other.

The First Church at NEWPORT and its founder now invite our attention. John Clarke, M.D., has few peers in any respect amongst the founders of New England, and, except in point of time, is more properly the father of the Baptists there than Roger Williams, who must ever remain its great apostle of religious liberty. Clarke was born in Suffolk, England, in 1609; was liberally educated and practiced as a physician in London for a time; but seems to have been equally versed in law and theology, with medicine. His religious and political principles led him to cast in his lot with the New World and he arrived in Boston in November, 1637. There is no evidence that he was a Baptist at this time, but rather he seems to have been a Puritan, much like Roger Williams when he landed there; and as Clarke expected to practice medicine in Boston, he would scarcely have been tolerated there at all as a Baptist. At that moment the Congregational Churches of Boston and vicinity were in a warm controversy with Mrs. Hutchinson and

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

her brother-in-law, Mr. Wheelwright, touching their doctrines. After they were banished, November 20th, 1637, excitement ran high, and a number of persons who had more or less sympathy with them, either on account of their views or their banishment, determined to retire from the colony and found one of their own, where they could have peace. Clarke went with this band, it is supposed to New Hampshire, where they spent the winter of 1637-38 at or near Dover. Finding the climate too severe, in the spring they determined to make either for Long Island or Delaware. When they reached Cape Cod, they left their vessel to go overland and make for Providence, where Roger Williams welcomed them warmly, from which time the names of Clarke and Williams become inseparable in the political and religious history of our country.

Williams suggested that they remain in that region, and after deliberate consideration, Clarke purchased of the Indians, through the agency of Williams, Aquidneck, otherwise and now called the island of Rhode Island, whose chief city is Newport. "Their first settlement was at the north end of the island, at what is now Portsmouth. Here, March 7th, 1638, their first step was to form a civil government, declaring themselves a 'body-politic,' submitting themselves to Christ and his holy 'truth, to be guided and judged thereby,' much after the form of the Pilgrims at Plymouth. They then chose Coddington as judge or magistrate, appointed civil officers, and voted a whipping-post, a jail and a pair of stocks. At one time, it was supposed that this was a religious compact, because they appointed 'three elders,' January 2d, 1639. These, however, were civil officers, or associate judges in the Hebrew sense. They were to assist Coddington 'in the execution of justice and judgment, for the regulating and ordering of all offenses and offenders,' and they were to report

to the freemen quarterly. They also determined that in laying out the town, two civil commissioners should locate the meeting-house for Portsmouth. These settlers numbered eighteen, most of them being Congregationalists and members of Cotton's Church in Boston, but some of them were under its censure and that of the Court of Massachusetts for imbibing certain peculiar views of Christian doctrine. Whether Anne Hutchinson was with them at the moment does not appear, but her husband was. So far as appears none of them were Baptists, but sympathized with her in theological sentiments, as John Cotton and Sir Henry Vane did at one time, and now determined to enjoy the freedom of their consciences. It is not clear whether Clarke was at this time a Congregationalist, but they formed a Church, to which he was the preacher, whether or not he was the pastor. Winthrop's Journal implies that there were no Baptists amongst them. Indeed, why should the State Church at Boston send a deputation to a Baptist Church at Portsmouth? He says that they 'gathered a Church in a very disorderly way; for they took some excommunicated persons, and others who were members of the Church in Boston and were not dismissed.'...That 'many of Boston and others, who were of Mrs. Hutchinson's judgment and partly removed to the isle of Aquiday; and others who were of the rigid separation, and savored of anabaptism, removed to Providence.' Had he known of a Baptist at Portsmouth, he would have been likely to say so, and would not have contented himself with mentioning that this Church was gathered in a disorderly way.

In February, 1640, the Boston Church sent three of its members 'to understand their judgments in divers points of religion formerly maintained by all or divers of them.' This committee of discipline reported to that Church, March 16th, 1640, that the new Church at

Portsmouth was irregular in that they followed the unwarrantable practice of taking the Lord's Supper with excommunicated persons; but the deputation gives no hint that any of them were Baptists. The Portsmouth Church refused to hear these messengers, demanding: 'What power one Church hath over another?' When they reported to Cotton's Church: 'The elders and most of the Churches would have cast them out, as refusing to hear the Church, but all not being agreed it was deferred.' In 1638 Newport was settled, at the south end of the island, where a Church was formed in 1641, of which Clarke was pastor, probably another Congregational Church, for we have no sign that even then he held Baptist views of the ordinances. Lechford, who visited the Rhode Island colonies, and speaks freely of them (1637-41) says: 'At Providence, which is twenty miles from the said island (R.I.), lives Master Williams, and his company, of divers opinions; most are Anabaptists.' But of Newport, which he also visited, he says: 'At the island called Acquedney are about two hundred families. There was a Church where one Master Clarke was elder. The place where the Church was is called Newport. But that Church, I hear, is now dissolved.'

The next most reliable account of Clarke is from John Callender, the sixth successor to Clarke, as pastor of the First Baptist Church at Newport, who preached the Century Sermon at Newport, March 24th, 1738. In his discourse he uses this language: 'It is said that in 1644 Mr. John Clarke and some others formed a Church on the scheme and principles of the Baptists. It is certain that in 1648 there were fifteen members in full communion.' In 1730 Comer, an earlier successor of Clarke, says that this body maintained 'the doctrine of efficacious grace, and professed the baptizing of only visible believers upon personal profession by a total immersion in water, though the first

certain record of this Church is October 12th, 1648.' An interesting item may be mentioned here, namely: That Samuel Hubbard and his wife, of Fairfield, held to the baptism of believers, and she being arraigned twice for this faith, they removed to Newport and united with Clarke's Church November 3d, 1648.

These things taken together lead to the highly probable conclusion, that Clarke became a Baptist somewhere between 1640 and 1644, but we have no record of the time of his baptism, or that of his Church. A long train of circumstances indicate that his steps had led in the same path with those of Williams in the main; through Puritanism, love of religious liberty, disgust at the intolerance of Massachusetts, and so into full Baptist positions. Williams was not a Baptist when he first met Clarke, early in 1638, nor was he immersed till March, 1639, a year afterward. With the brotherly affection which subsisted, between them, the intervention of Williams in securing the island of Rhode Island to Clarke, and their common views on soul-liberty, is it reasonable to suppose that Williams would have sought baptism at the hands of an immersed layman, if Clarke, his next neighbor, was then a Baptist? True, Williams had ceased to be a Baptist when the Baptist Church of which Clarke became pastor was formed, so that he could not have baptized Clarke. But other elders had taken the Church that Williams had left, and Clarke could have received baptism of one of them at Providence, as easily as William Vaughn, of the First Baptist Church at Newport, could go to Providence and receive imposition of hands from Wickenden in 1652. Be this as it may, however, there is nothing to show that Clarke was a Baptist in England, but much to indicate that his love for liberty of conscience led him to embrace Baptist principles and practices in Rhode Island. Morgan Edwards writes of the Newport

Chapter 4 - The Providence and Newport Churches

Church:

'It is said to have been a daughter of Providence Church, which was constituted about six years before. And it is not at all unlikely that they might be enlightened, in the affair of believer's baptism, by Roger Williams and his company, for whom they had the greatest kindness...Clarke, its first minister, 1644, remained pastor till 1676, when he died...Tradition says that he was a preacher before he left Boston, but that he became a Baptist after his settlement in Rhode Island, by means of Roger Williams.' [*Materials for Hist. of Baptists in R.I.*]

His services in the cause of God and liberty were a marvel. In 1651 the colony sent him and Williams to obtain a new charter, which would set aside Coddington's. Williams returned in 1654, leaving Clarke alone to manage the affair, which he did during the Protectorate, and in 1663 he secured from Charles II that remarkable document which was held as fundamental law in Rhode Island till 1842. It was an immense triumph of diplomacy to obtain a charter from Charles II, which declared that 'no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be anywise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any differences of opinion or matters of religion.' No wonder that he was hailed with delight on his return to Rhode Island in 1664, after an absence of twelve long years on this high mission.

He served the public in the General Assembly as Deputy Governor, and in other capacities, requiring strength of judgment and versatility of talents. His 'News from New England,' 'Narrative of New England Persecutions,' with several other works, bear the marks of a powerful pen. Callender said of him: 'No character in New England is of purer fame than John Clarke.' The Historian of Rhode Island says that 'to him Rhode Island was chiefly indebted for the extension of her

territory on each side of the bay, as well as for her royal charter.' And Roger Williams bears this testimony: 'The grand motive which turned the scale of his life was the truth of God – a just liberty to all men's spirits in spiritual matters, together with the peace and prosperity of the whole colony.' As a consistent Baptist, he displayed a healthy comprehension of all our principles and gave a beautiful unity to our infant cause in the colonies. And it is equally beautiful to see how he accepted from Williams all that related to liberty of conscience, although Williams did not agree with him in regard to Church life. Williams, at Providence, made the distinction between Church and State, radical and complete from the first. Clarke at first took the Bible as the code of the civil State, so that in Providence Church and State were distinct, but in Aquidneck they were confounded, and only after severe experience did that colony come to adopt the Providence doctrine. When this was done, Baptist Churches sprang up in different directions, under the missionary influences of the Newport Church, and people came from many places to unite in its fellowship.

These two Baptists shaped the early history of the present State of Rhode Island, and her religious policy has since shaped that of all the States. After the Providence Plantations and the people of Narraganset Bay became united under one charter, an old writer said of them: 'They are much like their neighbors, only they have one vice less and one virtue more than they; for they never persecuted any; but have ever maintained a perfect liberty of conscience.' After quoting these words, Edwards remarks:

'In 1656 the Colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Haven pressed them hard to give up the point, and join the confederates to crush the Quakers, and prevent any more from coming to New England. This they refused, saying: "We shall

The American Baptists

strictly adhere to the foundation principle on which this colony was first settled, to wit: That every man who submits peaceably to the civil authority, may peaceably worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience without molestation." This answer made the said colonies hate them the more, and meditate their ruin by slanderous words and violent actions. They had to resist Old England as well as New England. Sir Henry Vane admonished them in a letter. Williams says: "I spent almost five years' time with the State of England to keep off the rage of the English against us." Letter-writers calumniated them as the scum and runaways of other countries which, in time, would bring a heavy burden on the land – as sunk into barbarity, that they could speak neither good English nor good sense, as libertines, antinomians, and every thing except what is good, as despisers of God's worship, and without order or government. In their address to the Lord Protector, 1659, they say: "We bear with the several judgments and consciences of each other in all the towns of our colony, the which our neighbor colonies do not; which is the only cause of their great offense against us." [*Materials for Hist. of Baptists in R.I.*]

Mr. Clarke passed through several severe controversies. One, on the 'inner-light' question, with those who claimed to be led entirely thereby. Many of them were called 'Seekers,' and some became 'Friends.' Against this doctrine Clarke contended manfully for the Baptist claim of the sufficiency of the Bible as

the rule of faith and practice, and carried the public sentiment with him. In 1652, while he was in England, the question of 'laying on of hands' as a test of membership arose. A number withdrew from his Church in 1656, on this issue, and formed a 'Six Principle' Baptist Church in Newport; then, in 1671, another body went out and formed a 'Seventh Day' Church, on the persuasion that the seventh day is the divinely appointed Sabbath. The first successor of Clarke as pastor was Obadiah Holmes, 1676-82; the second Richard Dingley, 1689-94; then William Peckham, 1711-32; John Comer, 1726-29, a colleague to Peckham. John Callender became pastor in 1731, died in 1748, and from him the pastoral succession has gone on in a line of worthies which would honor the history of any Church, while many of its deacons have been known as the first men in the commonwealth. The Church has always been Calvinistic, and has practiced singing as a part of public worship, excepting for a time, in the early part of the eighteenth century. In 1726 it voted to take 'a weekly contribution for the support of the ministry.' It has been a living, working band of Christians from its organization, and stands on the old platform where it has stood for nearly two and a half centuries as prominent and healthful as a city on a hill.

Chapter 5 - Chauncey – Knollys – Miles and the Swansea Church

Several hints are found in the early colonial writings, that an individual here and there amongst the colonists inclined to Baptist views in relation to infant baptism and immersion before the immersion of Williams. Governor Winslow wrote of the Baptists, in 1646: 'We have some living amongst us, nay, some of our Churches, of that judgment;' and Mather states that 'many of the first settlers of Massachusetts were Baptists, and they were as holy and watchful and faithful and heavenly a people as any, perhaps, in the world.' [*Hypocrisy Unmasked*, Magnalia, ii, 459] We have seen that when Williams was banished he was not a Baptist, nor does it appear that there was then one immersed believer in America. There is no evidence that he expressed any difference with his Pedobaptist brethren as to the proper subjects and method of baptism before he found himself in the wilderness. Yet we have seen that while he was teacher at Plymouth, Elder Brewster read his Baptist tendencies in his preaching, and predicted that he would run into 'Anabaptistry.' It is, therefore, a singular fact that Rev. Charles Chauncey who had been an Episcopal clergyman in England, and who arrived in Boston in 1638, should have brought the doctrine of immersion with him, and made directly for that same Plymouth, where somehow there was an 'Anabaptist' taint in the air, to the scant edification of Brewster. Felt writes that Chauncey arrived at Plymouth 'a few days before the great earthquake on the 1st of June,' 1638. At that time Mr. Reyner was teacher to the Church at Plymouth, and Morton's manuscript reports this:

'After Mr. Reyner had been in place a considerable time it was desired that Mr. Charles Chauncey should be invited, who, being a very godly and learned man, they intended upon trial to choose him pastor of the Church here for the more comfortable performance of the ministry with Mr. John

Reyner, the teacher of the same; but there fell out some difference about baptizing, he holding it ought only to be by dipping and putting the whole body under water, and that sprinkling was unlawful. The Church yielded that immersion or dipping was lawful, but in this cold country not so convenient. But they could not and durst not yield to him in this – that sprinkling, which all the Churches of Christ, for the most part, at this day practice, was unlawful and a human invention, as the same was pressed; but they were willing to yield to him as far as they could and to the utmost, and were contented to suffer him to practice as he was persuaded, and when he came to minister that ordinance he might do it to any that did desire it in that way; provided, he could peaceably suffer Mr. Reyner and such as desired it to have theirs otherwise baptized by him, by sprinkling or pouring on of water upon them, so as there might be no disturbance in the Church thereabouts. But he said he could not yield thereunto, upon which the Church procured some other ministers to dispute the point with him publicly, as Mr. Ralph Patrick, of Duxburrow, who did it sundry times, ably and sufficiently, as also some other ministers within this government; but he was not satisfied; so the Church sent to many other Churches to crave their help and advice in this matter, and, with his will and consent, sent them his arguments written under his own hand. They sent them to the Church of Boston, in the Bay of Massachusetts, to be communicated with other Churches there; also they sent the same to the Churches of Connecticut and New Haven, with sundry others, and received very able and sufficient answers, as they conceived, from them and their learned ministers, who all concluded against him. But himself was not satisfied therewith. Their answers were too large here to relate. They conceived the Church had done what was meet in the thing.'

While this Baptist principle was planting itself, by the hands of one who was not a Baptist, in the very Mayflower Church – and possibly Chauncey practiced immersion from the very rock on which the Pilgrims landed –

The American Baptists

the same leaven was working its way into the heart of the Plymouth colony, at Scituate. In Chap. II, of the British Baptists, we have seen that Spilsbury's Church, London, came out of the Church of which Lathrop, the Separatist, was pastor, in 1633. In 1634 Lathrop himself left London, with about thirty of his members, and settled at Scituate, Mass. Dean, the Scituate historian, agreeing entirely with Wilson about the troubles of that Church in regard to baptism, says:

'Controversy respecting the mode of baptism had been agitated in Mr. Lathrop's Church before he left England, and a part had separated from him, and established the first Baptist (Calvinistic) Church in England in 1633. Those that came seem not all to have been settled on this point, and they found others in Scituate ready to sympathize with them.'

Lathrop remained in Scituate as pastor until 1639, when he and a majority of his Church removed to Barnstable, and Chauncey became pastor at Scituate. Dean further says that a majority of those left at Scituate believed in immersion, but 'nearly half the Church were resolute in not submitting to that mode.' One party held to 'infant sprinkling; another to adult immersion exclusively; and a third, of which was Mr. Chauncey, to immersion of infants as well as of adults.' Winthrop shows that down to June, 1640, Chauncey was still at Plymouth, though not as pastor, and considerable excitement arose there about his views on baptism. On November 2d, 1640, Hooker, Williams's opponent, wrote to Shepherd, his son-in-law, thus:

'I have of late had intelligence from Plymouth. Mr. Chauncey and the Church are to part, he to provide for himself, and they for themselves. At the day of fast, when a full conclusion of the business should have been made, he openly professed he did as verily

believe the truth of his opinion as that there was a God in heaven, and that he was as settled in it as that the earth was upon the center. If ever such confidence find success I miss my mark. Mr. Humphrey, I hear, invites him to Providence, and that coast is most meet for his opinions and practice.' [Felt, *Ecc. Hist.*, I, p. 443]

He seems to have been greatly beloved at Plymouth, for Winthrop writes that the Church there 'were loath to part with him;' and Bradford that he 'removed to Scituate, against the earnest wishes of the Plymouth Church to retain him.' He continued his ministry at Scituate till 1654, and, the minority of his Church there having formed a new Church, February 2d, 1642, those that were left seem to have been a unit on the subject of immersion. [Dean, *Hist. Scit.*, p. 60] Some of the records in this case are interestingly quaint, such as this: 'Cotton answers Chauncey's arguments,' and the 'Church at Plymouth dissents from Chauncey's views, one of the reasons being 'that immersion would endanger the lives of infants in winter, and to keep all baptisms till summer hath no warrant in God's word.' [Felt, I, 442] It does not appear, however, that he or his congregation became Baptists, for they retained infant baptism.

Felt says of him, July 7th, 1642: 'Chauncey at Scituate still adheres to his practice of immersion. He had baptized two of his own children in this way. A woman of his congregation who had a child of three years old, and wished it to receive such an ordinance, was fearful that it might be too much frightened by being dipped, as some had been. She desired a letter from him, recommending her to the Boston Church, so that she might have the child sprinkled. He complied, and the rite was accordingly administered.' [Felt, I, 497] November 27th, 1654, he became President of Harvard College.

HANSERD KNOLLYS had avowed

himself a Non-conformist in England, and had been made a prisoner at Boston, in Lincolnshire, but his keeper allowed him to escape, and with his wife he arrived at Boston, Mass., July, 1638. There he was looked upon with suspicion, and reported to the authorities as an Antinomian. Two men in Piscataqua (Dover, N.H.) came and invited him there to preach, and in August he went. He remained there and formed a Church, to which he preached till September, 1641, when he removed, with certain of his congregation, to Long Island, N.Y. where Forrett, agent of the Duke of York, protested against his remaining; and he arrived in London, December 24th, 1641. While in Dover he had trouble into which baptism entered as an element, although Knollys was not a Baptist at that time. Lechford, an Episcopalian, who visited Dover in 1641, speaks of him as then engaged in a controversy about baptism and Church membership. The baptismal point appears to have concerned infant baptism, and on this wise. Another Church sprang up in Dover, whether *denovo* or as a split from Knollys's, does not appear, but a majority of the people went to the other Church, under the lead of a Mr. Larkham, an English Puritan and a graduate of Cambridge, who could not agree with the Congregationalists here. At Dover Larkham 'received all into his Church, even immoral persons, who promised amendment, he baptized any children offered, and introduced the Episcopal service at funerals'

Knollys and his Church excommunicated Larkham and his adherents, and a tumult arose in the community that brought no great honor to either side. One of the things that drove Knollys out of the English Church, says Wilson, was his scruple against 'the cross in baptism, etc., and he objected to the admission of notoriously wicked persons to the Lord's Supper.' His refusal to take immoral persons into the

Church, and to baptize children, 'any offered' as Larkham did, implies that he believed in personal regeneration as a qualification for membership, but not necessarily that he rejected infant baptism entirely, as he might have thought, with John Robinson, that the children of believers only should be christened. Indeed, it is quite probable that he did not then reject infant baptism altogether, for on March 23d, 1640, we find him bearing letters from the Dover to the Boston Church, asking advice about the scruples of the former Church as to whether they should have any fellowship with excommunicated persons, 'except in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper?' In their answer the Boston Church calls them 'godly brethren, who came from the Church of Dover,' and tells them that the excommunicated might be present at preaching or prayers, and other ordinances of the Church, but not at the Supper. To this Knollys replied: 'It is desired by our Church that the elders of this Church would certify their judgments by letter.' All of which is inconsistent with the idea that either he or his Church were Baptists at that time, while seeking the advice of a Congregational Church. Nor, had they been Baptists, should we have found Knollys first writing from Dover to friends in London, complaining that the government of the Bay was 'worse than a high commission,' and then sending, July, 1639, a retraction to Winthrop, and afterward, February 20th, 1640, making a public confession, in a lecture delivered before the elders and magistrates of New Hampshire, that he had slandered the Bay government. In fact, this body would not have heard a lecture from a Baptist. [Felt, ii, pp. 449,399,448] All the power of England could not have compelled him to humble himself thus ten years later. Baptist principles had clearly begun to work their way into his mind in Dover, and on his return to London the work was completed. For

a time he kept school in his own house on Great Tower Hill; then he was chosen master of a free school in St. Mary Axe, where in one year he had one hundred and fifty-six scholars; after which he went into the Parliament army to preach to the soldiers. When Episcopacy was laid aside he preached again in the parish churches, till the Presbyterians began to persecute him. This brought out his Baptist sentiments, which he avowed with great boldness when preaching one day in Bow Church, Cheapside. There his attack on infant baptism was so strong that, on a warrant, he was thrown into prison. As in the case of Clarke and Holmes we have no account of his baptism, but we find him immersing Henry Jesse in June, 1645, and in the same year he formed a Baptist Church at Great St. Helenas, London, where he preached to a thousand people, and became one of the noblest heroes that ever proclaimed the Baptist faith; probably New England having more to do in making him what he was as a Baptist than Old England. [Wilson, *Hist. Dissenting Chs*; Evans's *Eng. Baptists*, ii, 131] This agrees with Evans, who, speaking of Knollys becoming a Baptist, says of him: 'Knollys, some years before, had fled from the fierce anger of the hierarchy to the wilds of the New World, but had now returned.'

By some means a little Baptist leaven had found its way to Weymouth, Mass., in 1639. Robert Lenthal was to be settled there as pastor, when it was discovered that he held that 'all the requisite for Church membership should be baptism,' whatever this might mean. He, therefore, with several others, attempted to collect a Church, and got many subscribers to a paper with this in view. They were summoned before the Court in Boston, March 13th, 1639, when John Smith was fined twenty pounds, and committed during the pleasure of the Court; Richard Sylvester was disfranchised, and fined forty shillings; Ambrose Morion was fined ten

pounds; John Spur, twenty pounds; James Brittane was sentenced to be whipped eleven stripes, because he could not pay his fine; and Lenthal was required to appear at the next Court. He went to Rhode Island, and we find him there with Clarke. It is hard to understand exactly what his views were, but the 'Massachusetts Records' say he held 'that only baptism was the door of entrance into the visible Church,' such a Church 'as all baptized ones might communicate in,' which looks like adult baptism.

JOHN MILES AND THE BAPTIST CHURCH AT SWANSEA, MASS. So far as is known Miles was the first Welsh Baptist minister who ever crossed the Atlantic. He was born in 1621, at Newton, near the junction of the historic rivers, Olchon and Escle. He matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford, March 11th, 1636, and is on record as 'a minister of the Gospel' in 1649, in which year he formed the first Strict Communion Church at Ilsten, near Swansea, Wales (so spelled at that time, according to Thomas), now Swansea. His love of truth, his art in organization, together with his perseverance and courage, soon made him a leader in the denomination; and in 1651 we find him representing the Welsh Baptists at the Minister's Meeting in London. Persecution soon selected him as one of its first victims, and when the cruel Act of Uniformity, 1662, ejected two thousand ministers, and opened all sorts of new sufferings to God's servants, he, with a large number of his Church, removed to America, carrying their Church records with them, which are still preserved. They settled at Wannamoiset, then within the bounds of Rehoboth, but afterward, 1667, called Swansea, and but ten miles from Providence, though in the Plymouth Colony.

The finger of God guided them to this as a field prepared for Baptist culture, and a fruitful one it became. In 1646 Obadiah Holmes had

removed there from Salem, of which Church he had been a member and united with the Congregational Church, under the pastoral charge of Mr. Newman. But, in some way he and eight others had imbibed Baptist principles, possibly from Williams, and in 1649 they established a separate meeting of their own. For this they were excommunicated and punished by the civil authority. The whole commonwealth of Plymouth was stirred and petitions against them came pouring in, one signed by all the clergy of the colony except two, and one from the government of Massachusetts itself. In June, 1650, Holmes and Joseph Torrey were bound to appear at the next court, and in October they, with eight others, were indicted by the Grand Jury. It is difficult to find what penalty was inflicted on them, but, suffice it, their meeting was broken up, and Holmes, with most of his brethren, removed to Newport, where, in due time, he became the pastor of the Baptist Church. The following is the presentment by the grand inquest: 'October the 2d, 1650. We, whose names are heer under written, being the grand inquest, doe present to this Court, John Hazael, Mr. Edward Smith and wife, Obadiah Holmes, Joseph Tory and his wife, and the wife of James Man, William Deuell and his wife, of the town of Rehoboth, for continueing of a meeting uppon the Lord's day from house to house, contrary to the order of this Court enacted June 12th, 1650.' [*Plymouth Records*, ii, p. 162]

Things were in this condition when Miles and his brethren arrived on the ground, and in 1663, soon after their arrival, they formed the first Baptist Church in what is now the State of Massachusetts. Seven men, whose names have come down to us with that of 'John Miles' at their head (the names of the females are not given), formed a Church covenant in the house of John Butterworth, and a noble band they were. From the first, Miles was a favorite in the

community, and on March 13th, 1666, the people of Rehoboth voted that he should lecture for them on the Sabbath and once in two weeks on the week-day. After the death of Mr. Newman, who opposed Miles earnestly, Mr. Symmes had preached for several years in the Pedobaptist Church, and still preached there. Hence this action made great disturbance. So, May 23d, the town agreed: 'That a third man alone for the work of the ministry should be forthwith looked for, and such an one as may preach to the satisfaction of the whole, if it be the will of God, for the settling of peace amongst us.' Richard Bullock protested against this act 'as the sole work of the Church.' This infant Church suffered various legal difficulties, and the Court at Plymouth fined Miles five pounds, July 2d, 1667, for setting up a public meeting without the knowledge and approbation of the Court. They were ordered to stop the meeting where it was then held, but if they would remove to another point, and behaved well there, perhaps they might be permitted to remain in the colony.

Soon after, this Church was brought face to face With a new and great danger. Finding that they were decent citizens after all their heterodoxy, the colony was disposed to give them a grant of land, and did so: to 'Captain Thomas Willet, Mr. Paine, Sr., Mr. Brown, John Alien, and John Butterworth,' as trustees for a new town. Willet and Paine were not Baptists, the others were, and amongst other things Willet proposed: 'That no erroneous persons be admitted into the township.' This tried the metal of the Welsh brethren on the tenet of soul-liberty, of which subject they knew but little, and well-nigh tripped. Glad to find a place where they could worship God in peace, they 'gathered and assembled' as a Church, and addressed an 'explication' to the trustees, in which they conceded, that

The American Baptists

'Such as hold damnable heresies, inconsistent with the faith of the Gospel; as, to deny the Trinity, or any person therein; the deity or sinless humanity of Christ or the union of both natures in him, or his full satisfaction to the divine justice of all his elect, by his active and passive obedience, or his resurrection, ascension into heaven, intercession, or his second coming personally to judgment; or else to deny the truth or divine authority of the Scriptures, or the resurrection of the dead, or to maintain any merit of works, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, giving divine adoration to any creature, or any other antichristian doctrine, directly opposing the priestly, prophetic, or kingly offices of Christ, or any part thereof; or such as hold such opinions as are inconsistent with the well-being of the place, as to deny the magistrates power to punish evil doers, as well as to encourage those that do well, or to deny the first day of the week to be observed by divine institution as the Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, or to deny the giving of honor to whom honor is due, or to oppose those civil respects that are usually performed according to the laudable customs of our nation each to other, as bowing the knee or body, etc., or else to deny the office, use, or authority of the ministry, or a comfortable maintenance to be due to them from such as partake of their teachings, or to speak reproachfully of any of the Churches of Christ in the country, or of any such other Churches of Christ in the country, or of any such other Churches as are of the same common faith with us or them; all such might be excluded!' [Backus, I, 285,286; Weston's ed.]

What were those Welshmen thinking about? Clearly, they had not been to school at Salem yet, and we may be thankful that they were corresponding with a militia officer and not forming a new State, or, in a short time, Swansea would have been as bad as Glamorganshire, from which they had fled. They remind one of birds in the stress of storm, who make for the first bright light, and in their joy dash themselves against it to destruction, rather than use it as a guide. But their folly is

more apparent still when we find them drawing a distinction between essential and non-essential Christian doctrines thus:

'We desire that it be also understood and declare that this is not understood of any holding any opinion different from others in any disputable point, yet in controversy among the godly learned, the belief thereof not being essentially necessary to salvation; such as pedobaptisin, antipedobaptism, church discipline or the like; but that the minister or ministers of the said town may take their liberty to baptize infants or grown persons as the Lord shall persuade their consciences, and so also the inhabitants take their liberty to bring their children to baptism or to forbear.'

It is slightly comforting that they were so far in advance of the neighboring colonies as to allow their neighbors to christen their children, if 'the Lord shall persuade their consciences,' while their neighbors would not allow them to be immersed on their faith in Christ, whether the Lord had persuaded their consciences thereto or not. Still, as Baptists, they were far enough from hard-pan at that time, on the subject of religious liberty. A little of Roger Williams's back-bone would not have hurt them at all, or even a bit of honest John Price's old Welsh obstinacy. He was a Baptist minister at Dolan, who endured great persecution, and died at Nantmel, 1673. He would not conform to the Church of England in any thing, and as that Church always buried its dead with the head toward the west, he ordered his buried toward the east. Then, a brass plate was to be put on his grave-stone to certify that he would not conform to their whims dead or alive.

John Miles soon became a power in all the region round about. December 19th, 1674, the town appointed him master of a school, at a salary of forty pounds per annum, 'for teaching grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, and the tongues of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, also to read English and to write.' His house was made the

Chapter 5 - Chauncey – Knollys – Miles and the Swansea Church

garrison for the military forces when the town was assaulted in the Indian War under King Philip, June 24th, 1675. The Church multiplied and became strong, taking deep root in the colony. They built their first meeting-house about three miles north-east of Warren, and in 1679 a new one at Kelley's Bridge, with a parsonage for Miles. But they were stoutly opposed, until the whole region became Baptist. It is reported of their pastor, that once when brought before the magistrates for preaching, he asked for a Bible, and turning to Job 19:28, read: 'Ye should say, Why persecute we him, seeing the root of the matter is found in me?' He said no more, but sat down and the Court so felt the power of the passage that, instead of cruelty, he was treated with kindness. He died at Tyler's Point, February 3d, 1683.

We have seen that the authorities of Massachusetts were sorely tried with the leniency of Plymouth in the case of Holmes and his compeers at Rehoboth, but as they could do nothing further in that direction, they proceeded at once to make things as stringent as possible for the persecution of Baptists in their own jurisdiction. Judging by their excited condition, a plague broke out in the colony which might be designated the 'anabaptistical-phobia,' and fright seized them as if some one had been bitten by a live Baptist. The General Court caught the disease badly, and on the 13th of November, 1644, decreed:

'It is ordered and decreed, that if any person or persons, within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or the lawful right and authority to make war, or to punish the outward breakers of the first table, and shall appear to the Court willfully and obstinately to continue therein

after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment.'

But the reasons which they give in the preamble, are, if possible, more expressive of their unhappy condition than the law itself; hence, they use these words to introduce the enactment:

'Forasmuch as experience hath plentifully and often proved that, since the first arising of the Anabaptists, about one hundred years since, they have been the incendiaries of the commonwealths and the infectors of persons in many matters of religion, and the troubles of Churches in all places where they have been, and that they who have held the baptizing of infants unlawful have usually held other errors or heresies together therewith, though they have, as other heretics used to do, concealed the name till they spied out a fit advantage and opportunity to vent them by way of question or scruple; and whereas divers of this kind have, since our coming into New England, appeared amongst ourselves, some whereof have, as others before them, denied the ordinance of magistracy, and the lawfulness of making war, and others the lawfulness of magistrates and their inspection into any breach of the first table; which opinions, if they should be connived at by us, are like to be increased amongst us, and so must necessarily bring guilt upon us, infection and trouble to the Churches, and hazard to the whole commonwealth.'

This state of high fever brought the patient to a crisis, and left him extremely weak when the black train of his dreams and horrible bugbears had passed away. In other words, it was the beginning of the end with religious tyranny in Massachusetts, and under the ruling of divine Wisdom this was the best day's work that its Court ever did for that present glorious State. Men of conscience and common sense felt it a sorry time when their common brethren in Christ Jesus had come to be 'banished' as

The American Baptists

'heretics' in a free land, for opposing the baptism of infants, or leaving a congregation where it was practiced, as hazarding the existence of a Christian commonwealth, and bringing 'guilt' upon the venerable heads of those who could not keep their hands off the 'first table' of God's law. As might have been expected, this abuse of power awakened a heart-felt indignation all over the colony, for it touched the consciences of men, and without guise or pretense, assumed control over them. Remonstrance and petition soon found expression; many petitions against the law and others for its continuance came in from various sources, some in March, 1645, others in May, 1646. Yet the Court not only refused to repeal the law, but even to alter or explain it, although Samuel Maverick, Dr. Child and five others of great influence, not Baptists, threatened to appeal to Parliament on this and other subjects of grievance. The Court was compelled to issue a 'Declaration' to the people in its own defense, in which they were weak enough to confess that the Baptists were 'peaceable' citizens amongst them. They say, November 4th, 1646, to those that

'Are offended also at our law against Anabaptists. The truth is, the great trouble we have been put unto and hazard also, by familistical and anabaptistical spirits, whose conscience and religion hath been only to set forth themselves and raise contentions in the country, did provoke us to provide for our safety by a law, that all such should take notice how unwelcome they should be unto us, either coming or staying. But for such as differ from us only in judgment, in point of baptism, or some other points of less consequence, and live peaceably amongst us, without occasioning disturbance, etc., such have no cause to complain, for it hath never been as yet put in execution against any of them, although some are known to live amongst us.'

Why could they not leave Pilate alone in

history, to wash his hands in innocency? That business belonged to the Old, not the New, World. Every syllable here shows their misgivings and counter consciousness touching their own Law. They begin by depreciating their enactment into a 'notice' the law itself says that it is a provision for banishment.' They say that the Baptist 'conscience and religion' have raised 'contentions in the country; 'their law itself says that they were 'incendiaries of the commonwealth.' Here, they taper down the Baptist offense to a difference 'from us only in judgment in point of baptism;' the law calls them 'heretics' and 'troublers of Churches.' Their Declaration says that those Baptists who 'live peaceably amongst us, without occasioning disturbance, shall have no cause to complain;' but their law also says that it is disturbance of itself, 'to openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance.' And finally, their appeal to the public says that 'some of the Baptists were known to live peaceably amongst us,' but to deny the right of the magistrates' authority to punish the outward breakers of the first table, is a just reason why they should 'be sentenced to banishment,' and this the most 'peaceful' of them denied. It is a sure thing that both their 'Tenet' and its commentary need washing again thoroughly. Complaints went over to England, and as there was now no chance to glory over this matter under the pretense of civil wrongdoing, as in the case of Roger Williams, the thing must be met there on its naked merits, as a square act of religious tyranny. Hence, Governor Winslow was sent to England to answer this charge. [Mass. Col. Records, ii, p. 162]

Brought to an account before the home

government, it was demanded of him: 'You have a severe law against Anabaptists, yea, one was whipt at Massachusetts for his religion? And your law banisheth them?' To which the gracious old governor meekly answered: 'Tis true, the Massachusetts government have such a law as to banish, but not to whip in that kind. And certain men desiring some mitigation of it; it was answered in my hearing: 'Tis true, we have a severe law, but we never did, or will, execute the rigor of it upon any, and have men living amongst us, nay, some in our Churches of that judgment, and as long as they carry themselves peaceably as hitherto they do, we will leave them to God, ourselves having performed the duty of brethren to them. And whereas, there was one whipt amongst us, 'tis true we knew his judgment what it was; but had he not carried himself so contemptuously toward the authority God hath entrusted us with in an high exemplary measure, we had never so censured him; and, therefore, he may thank himself who suffered as an evil doer in that respect. But the reason whereof we are loath either to repeal or alter the law is, because we would have it remain in force to bear witness against their judgment and practice, which we conceive them to be erroneous.' [*Hypocrisy Unmasked*, 101]

The person reported by the governor as whipped here was Thomas Painter, of Hingham, whose contemptuous crime against the 'authority' of the magistrates consisted in refusing to have his child christened. True, the governor said, they had no law 'to whip in that kind,' which only aggravates their crime against humanity, for they did whip him, law or no law, and for what the governor says, they knew to be simply his 'judgment.' But from the mild manner in which he speaks of this harmless law, as a mere verbal 'witness' against 'erroneous' 'judgment and practice' on the part of the Baptists, they wished the British government to understand and treat it as a dead-letter. Indeed, he gives the promise in the name of Massachusetts, whose representative he was,

that although the law is severe, 'we never did, or will, execute the rigor of it upon any.' How did Massachusetts keep this sacred promise? We shall see.

The feeling engendered in England by this new crusade against 'heretics' in America, 1645, was very deep. Some, who had persecuted the Baptists there, supported the colony in its rigor, and some condemned it severely. Richard Hollingworth said: 'Our belief of New England is, that they would suffer the godly and peaceable to live amongst them, though they differ in point of Church government from them.' And another author, a member of John Goodwill's congregation, 'J.P.' wrote in as cool a strain: 'Why do not our Congregational divines write to the brethren of New England, and convince them of their error, who give, as some say, the civil magistrate a power to question doctrines, censure errors? Sure we are some have been imprisoned, some banished, that pleaded religion and mere conscience, and were no otherwise disturbers of the civil peace than the Congregational way is like to be here. If Old England be said to persecute for suppressing sects and opinions because threatening the truth and civil peace, why may not the same name be put upon New England, who are found in the same work and way?' Another thing which deepened the intense feeling on the subject was, that works on infant baptism, pro and con, began to flood the colony, and the people eagerly inquired what all these terribly blighting opinions of the 'Anabaptists' were; and when they found that the bugaboo lodged in the right of a man to keep his conscience whole in choosing to baptize his child or not, like reasonable beings they began also to think whether or not it were rather desirable to exercise such freedom where Jehovah had exacted no such service. Discussion was all that the Baptists needed to arrest this tyranny, and the law of 1644 had

unintentionally thrown the door wide open for such discussion, Hulbard speaks of 'many books coming out of England in the year 1645, some in defense of Anabaptism and other errors, and for liberty of conscience, as a shelter for a general toleration of all opinions'

As far back as 1643 Lady Deborah Moody, who had bought a farm of 400 acres at Swampscott, was obliged to remove to Gravesend, Long Island, 'for denying infant baptism.' Winthrop says of her: 'The Lady Moody, a wise and amiable religious woman, being taken with the errors of denying infant baptism, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the Church at Salem...To avoid further trouble, she removed to the Dutch, against the advice of her friends. Many others infested with Anabaptism removed thither also. She was after excommunicated.' [*Journal*, ii, pp. 123,124] True, she was a member of the Salem Church, which she united with April 5th, 1640, but lived in the Bay Colony, and left it 'to avoid further trouble.' Salem had become disturbed also on this Baptist issue, for July 8th, 1645, Townsend Bishop, a prominent man there, was 'presented,' Bays Felt, for 'turning his back on the ceremony of infant baptism.' He adds with significance, 'he soon left the town.'

But the authorities began to punish Baptists in Massachusetts Bay, under the law of 1644. William Witter, of Lynn, was arraigned before the Essex Quarterly Court, February, 1646, for saying that 'they who stayed while a child is baptized do worship the devil.' Martha West and Henry Collense testify that he charged such persons with breaking the Sabbath and taking the name of the Trinity in vain. Brother Witter certainly did give very free use to his tongue, but the Court had an effectual cure for all 'heretics' who did that. The law would not

connive at such 'opinions,' they were a 'hazard to the whole commonwealth;' he had openly condemned infant baptism, and had 'purposely' departed 'the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance,' and for such wickedness he must be recompensed. He was sentenced to make a public confession before the congregation at Lynn, on the next Sabbath, or be censured at the next General Court. John Wood was arraigned the next day before the same Court 'for professing Anabaptist sentiments and withholding his children from baptism,' and John Spur was bound to pay a fine of £20. On July 13th, 1651, Spur was expelled from the Boston Church, 'because he ceased to commune with them, on the belief that their baptism, singing of psalms and covenant, were human inventions.' By this time a spirit of general discontent was settling down upon the public mind, and persons in various places were beginning to express their sympathy for the Baptists and to adopt their sentiments on the subject of infant baptism; a state of things which the magistrates found it difficult to repress, and which at last forced not only resistance, but direct aggression, as the surest method of self-defense. Relief was found only in assuming a firm position and a determined stand against such grinding tyranny. If these Baptists stayed away from Congregational Churches, where they were unhappy, those Churches forced them to attend and treated them shamefully for not coming; then, if they went at their command, their presence made these Churches equally unhappy. They were disturbers of the peace when they kept away, and they were contentious when they went; a contradictory state of things which must cure itself, being a slander on the Lamb of God and a disgrace to the seventeenth century.

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

Fierce bigotry and intolerance did much for the ancient Baptists in Jerusalem of old, and this history repeated itself in Boston during the year 1651. The story is very simple. William Witter, a plain old farmer, lived at Swampscott, near Lynn, and was a member of the Congregational Church there. As far back as February 28th, 1643, he renounced infant baptism, and was brought before the Court, charged with speaking indecently of that ordinance. But having made some sort of an apology, he was arraigned a second time, February 18th, 1646, and was formally excommunicated July 24th, 1651, 'for absenting himself from the public ordinances nine months or more and for being rebaptized.' [Ms. Rec. Essex Court, 25, 9 mo., 1651] Meanwhile he had become a member of Clarke's Church at Newport; at what time does not appear, but evidently some time before, as he had not attended the Church at Lynn for more than nine months. Having become blind as well as old, and living little, if any thing, less than seventy-five miles from his Church, he was unable to attend its communion or to share its Christian sympathy and fellowship, all his surroundings being hostile to him. Whether he had invited a visit from representatives of the Newport Church, or they were prompted to visit him in his affliction, is not stated, but the Church records say: 'Three of the brethren, namely, Mr. John Clarke, pastor, Obadiah Holmes and James Crandall, were taken upon the Lord's day, July 20th, 1651, at the house of one of the brethren whom they went to visit; namely, William Witter, in the 'town of Lyn.' But it is clear from the record itself that he was a 'brother' in that Church, as Backus calls him; also Arnold, in his *History of Rhode Island* calls him 'an aged member' and Dr. Palfrey mentions him as a 'brother in the Church of Baptists.'

The above named three started on this mission of love worthy of Jesus himself and an honor to his servants. They passed quietly on their long journey, possibly through Boston, and reached Witter's home on Saturday night, hoping for a quiet Sabbath under a Christian roof. But this was criminal, much as Peter and John sinned against Jerusalem by helping a poor cripple there. When the Sabbath dawned they thought that they would 'worship God in their own way on the Lord's day' in Witter's family. Yes; but what right had they to think any such things Did they not know that it was a crime to worship God 'in your own way' even under your own roof, in Massachusetts? Not withstanding this Clarke began to preach God's word, from Rev. 3:10, to Witter's family, his two traveling companions, and, as he says, to 'four or live strangers that came in unexpected' after I had begun. Quite likely those sinners, of the Gentiles, John Wood, Joseph Bednap and Roger Scott, were all present. Wood had been tried, February 19th, 1646, for 'professing Anabaptist sentiments and withholding his children from baptism;' Rednap had broken the law in usually 'departing from the congregation at the time of administering the seal of baptism;' [Felt, *Ecc. Hist.*, ii, p. 46] and 'Scott was that drowsy sinner who was tried by the Court, February 28th, 1643, for common sleeping at the public exercise upon the Lord's day, and for striking him that waked him and was 'severely whipped' for the same in the ensuing December. This deponent saith not whether he really was at Witter's, or, if so, whether he wanted a quiet nap unaroused by a pugnacious Puritan Dogberry; perhaps he thought that a stirring Baptist sermon was just the novelty to keep him wide awake on that Sunday and in that particular place.

But no matter who was there, Clarke had begun to preach powerfully on the faithfulness

of God to his people in the hour of temptation, when two constables invaded the farm-house, rushing in with a warrant from Robert Bridges, the 'ordinary,' and the Newport brethren were brought before this officer of justice as prisoners. Bridges insisted that they should attend service at the State Church, and they insisted that they would not. Clarke said: 'If thou forcest us into your assembly we cannot hold communion with them.' Clarke was very clear-headed, but he mistook the squire, for it was not 'communion' that he was aiming at. The law required all to attend the State Church; and, therefore, them; and go they should anyhow, so they were forced into the assembly. Clarke says that when he was taken in he removed his hat and 'civilly saluted them,' but when he had been conducted to a seat he put on his hat, 'opened my book and fell to reading.' This troubled the 'ordinary,' and he commanded the constable to 'pluck off our hats, which he did, and where he laid mine there I let it lie.' When the service closed Clarke desired to speak to the congregation, but silence was commanded and the prisoners were removed. Some liberty was granted them on Monday, which they used, as Paul and Silas used theirs at Philippi, when they entered into the house of Lydia and exhorted the brethren. So here, Clarke and his brethren entered the house of Witter and actually shocked the magistrates by commemorating the love of Jesus together in observing the Lord's Supper. This act filled the cup of their iniquity to the brim, and it was probably the main object of their visit.

On Monday they were removed to Boston and cast into prison, the charges against them being, for 'disturbing the congregation in the afternoon, for drawing aside others after their erroneous judgments and practices, and for suspicion of rebaptizing one or more amongst us.' Clarke was fined £20, Holmes £30, Crandall £5, and on refusal to pay they were 'to

be well whipped,' although Winthrop had told the English government that they had no law 'to whip in that kind.' Edwards says that while 'Mr. Clarke stood stripped at the whipping-post some humane person was so affected with the sight of a scholar, a gentleman and reverend divine, in such a situation, that he, with a sum of money, redeemed him from his bloody tormentors.' Before this he had asked the Court: 'What law of God or man had he broken, that his back must be given to the tormentors for it, or he be despoiled of his goods to the amount of £20?' To which Endicott replied: 'You have denied infant baptism and deserve death, going up and down, and secretly insinuating into them that be weak, but cannot maintain it before our ministers' Clarke tells us 'that indulgent and tender-hearted friends, without my consent and contrary to my judgment, paid the fine.' [*Materials for Hist. R.I. Baptists*] Thus some one paid the fine of Clarke and Crandall, and proposed to pay that of Holmes. The first two were released, whether they assented or not, but Holmes who was a man of learning, and who afterward succeeded Dr. Clarke as pastor of the Newport Church, would not consent to the paying of his fine, and because he refused he was whipped thirty stripes, September 6th, 1651. He said that he 'durst not accept of deliverance in such a way.' He was found guilty of 'hearing a sermon in a private manner,' or, as the *mittimus* issued by Robert Bridges expresses it,

'For being taken by the constable at a private meeting at Lin, upon the Lord's day, exercising among themselves, to whom divers of the town repaired and joined with them, and that in time of public exercise of the worship of God; as also for offensively disturbing the peace of the congregation, at their coming into the public meeting in the time of prayer, in the afternoon, and for saying and manifesting that the Church in Lin was not constituted according to the order of our Lord...And for

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

suspicion of their having their hands in rebaptizing of one or more.'

Bancroft says that he was whipped 'unmercifully,' and Governor Jenks, 'that for many days, if not some weeks, he could take no rest but upon his knees and elbows, not being able to suffer any part of his body to touch the bed whereon he lay.' While enduring this torture, he joined his Lord on the cross and Stephen, in praying that this sin might not be laid to the charge of his persecutors; and when his lacerated flesh quivered and blood streamed from his body, so powerfully did the grace of the Crucified sustain him that he cheerfully said to his tormentors: 'You have struck me with roses!'

His remarkable words call to mind the superhuman saying of another noted Baptist, James Bainham, the learned Barrister of the Middle Temple, who was martyred in the days of Henry VIII. Fox shows (ii, p. 246) that he repudiated the baptism of infants. Sir Thomas More lashed him to the whipping-post in his own house at Chelsea, and the whip drew blood copiously from his back; then, when he was burning at the stake, his legs and arms being half-consumed, he exclaimed in triumph: 'O, ye Papists! behold ye look for miracles, and here you may see a miracle. In this fire I feel no more pain than if I were in a bed of down; it is to me as a bed of roses!' Holmes had much of this noble martyr's spirit. Most touchingly he himself wrote:

'I said to the people, though my flesh should fail and my spirit should fail, yet God will not fail; so it pleased the Lord to come in and so to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I break forth, praying unto the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found he did not fail me, and, therefore, now I should trust him forever who failed me not. For, in truth, as the strokes fell upon me I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's

presence as the like thereof I never had, nor can with fleshy tongue express, and the outward pain was so removed from me, that, indeed, I am not able to declare it to you. It was so easy to me that I could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not, although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength – yea, spitting on his hands three times, as many affirmed – with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosened me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, you have struck me as with roses, and said, moreover, although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charged.'

The vengeful feeling of the authorities toward these harmless men illustrates the severity which was intended. During their examination, Governor Endicott charged them with being 'Anabaptists,' said they 'deserved death,' and that 'they would not have such trash brought into their dominion.' The Court lost its temper, and even John Wilson, a clergyman of a very gentle spirit, struck Holmes, and said: 'The curse of God go with thee;' to which the sufferer replied: 'I bless God I am counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus.' After the whipping of Holmes, thirteen persons suffered in one way or another for the sympathy which they manifested for him and were unable to repress. John Spur and John Hazel were sentenced to receive ten lashes, or a fine of forty shillings each. Their crime was, that they had taken the holy confessor by the hand when he was led to the whipping-post by the executioner. This fine was paid by their friends without their consent. The story which they both tell in detail, of their arrest under warrants issued by Increase Nowel, as well as of their trial and sufferings for greeting their abused brother, are most affecting. Hazel being about sixty years of age and infirm, had come fifty

The American Baptists

miles to comfort his friend Holmes in prison. Professor Knowles tells us that this old Simeon from Rehoboth died before he reached his home. The saint paid a severe penalty for allowing his soft old heart to pity a poor lacerated brother, who had left his noble wife and eight children to visit the blind in his affliction.

This outrage aroused the most bitter resentment everywhere, and to his honor it should be known to the end of the world, that Richard Saltonstall, one of the first magistrates of Massachusetts, who was then in England, sent a dignified and indignant letter, dated April 25th, 1652, to Rev. Messrs. Cotton and Wilson, in which he wrote:

'It doth not a little grieve my spirit to hear what sad things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecutions in New England, as that you fine, whip, and imprison men for their consciences. First, you compel such to come into your assemblies as you know will not join with you in worship, and when they show their dislike thereof, and witness against it, then you stir up your magistrates to punish them for such as you conceive their public affronts...These rigid ways have laid you very low in the hearts of the saints. I do assure you that I have heard them pray in the public assemblies that the Lord would give you meek and humble spirits, not to strive so much for uniformity as to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. When I was in Holland, about the beginning of our wars, I remember some Christians there, that then had serious thoughts of planting in New England, desired me to write to the governor thereof, to know if those that differ from you in opinion, yet holding the same foundation in religion, as Anabaptists, Seekers, Antinomians, and the like, might be permitted to live among you, to which I received this short answer from your then governor, Mr. Dudley: "God forbid," said he, "our love for the truth should be grown so cold that we should tolerate errors." I hope you do not assume to yourselves infallibility of judgment...We pray for you and wish you

prosperity every way; hoped the Lord would have given you so much light and love there, that you might have been eyes to God's people here, and not to practice these courses in the wilderness which you went so far to prevent.' [Hutchinson's Col. Original Papers, pp. 401,3-8]

Cotton undertook in reply to justify the dark deed, and made as shameful a failure as ever an inquisitor made in defense of the Inquisition. He saw nothing in Holmes's conduct but willful obstinacy, and if a citizen is obstinate in his opinions is it not the bounden duty of the magistrates to whip it out? And so he threw the entire responsibility upon the victim himself. These are his words:

'As for his whipping, it was more voluntarily chosen by him than inflicted on him. His censure by the Court was to have paid, as I know, thirty pounds or else be whipped; his fine was offered to be paid by friends for him freely; but he chose rather to be whipped; in which case, if his suffering of stripes was any worship of God at all, surely it could be accounted no better than will-worship.'

So obtuse was his conscience in all that related to the freedom of man's soul in the worship of God, that he could not see the base injustice of fining a man for his convictions of duty to God, and then whipping him because he would not consent to recognize the righteousness of his own punishment by paying an unjust fine. Governor Jenks, of Rhode Island, understood the matter as Holmes understood it, and in writing, early in the eighteenth century, said:

'The paying of a fine seems to be but a small thing in comparison of a man's parting with his religion, yet the paying of a fine is the acknowledgment of a transgression; and for a man to acknowledge that he has transgressed, when his conscience tells him he has not, is but little, if any thing at all, short of parting

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

with his religion.'

But, with the heartlessness of a stone, Cotton says: 'The imprisonment of either of them was no detriment. I believe they fared neither of them better at home, and I am sure Holmes had not been so well clad in many years before.' He evidently respected Holmes's coat more than the shoulders which it covered. He continues:

'We believe there is a vast difference between men's inventions and God's institutions. We fled from men's inventions, to which we else should have been compelled; we compel none to men's inventions. If our ways, rigid ways as you call them, have laid us low in the hearts of God's people, yea, and of the saints, as you style them, we do not believe it is any part of their saintship.' [Mas. Hist., iii, pp. 403-6]

All this is rendered the more humiliating, when we keep in mind that the entire transaction was unlawful. The statute of November 13th, 1644, called for the 'banishment' of Baptists, but Winslow said that they had no law 'to whip in that kind;' hence, the wanton cruelty of the whole case, without even the show or pretense of law. Possibly this may account for the fact that so many able historians have passed it by in silence. Johnson does not refer to it in his *History of 1654*, nor Morton in his *Memorial of 1669*, nor Hubbard in his *History of 1680*, nor Mather in his of 1702. Others, who did make the record, generally palliated the conduct of the persecutors as best they could. But it was left for Dr. Palfrey, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, to make light of this helpless confessor's suffering, by expressing his suspicion that the magistrates sought 'to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law, at little cost to the delinquent.' It is difficult to understand how a grave historian can, with any show of seriousness, maintain that the

majesty of law was jeopardized by refusing to attend a State Church, and by taking the Lord's Supper elsewhere without disturbing any one; or if it were, that it could be vindicated by plowing furrows amongst the muscles and nerves of a Christian's back till it was raw. Besides, there was no law to be vindicated in this case. The statutes against the Baptists, as we see, provided that they should be banished, not flogged. If this brutal beating were a mere perfunctory farce, why was it necessary to deal out upon the quivering flesh of Holmes the last lash up to thirty? Increase Nowel was a ruling elder in the Church, the judges sat in its chief seats, and should have remembered the cruel scourging of their Saviour by a heartless judge. Instead, as Edwards says, 'with a whip of three cords belaboring his back till poor Holmes's flesh was reduced to jelly,' so they recollected their Redeemer in his servant. The thirty lashes with the three-corded whip counted ninety strokes in all; though others, whipped at the same time for rape and counterfeiting money, received but ten! And what does it count to the honor of his tormentors that the patient sufferer said: 'You have struck me as with roses.' The spiritual exaltation of martyrs in all ages has asserted itself by lifting them above physical sufferings, which, in themselves, have been most excruciating. Can it be pretended that because poor Bainham cried that the flames were like a bed of down, they therefore did not reduce his body to a cinder? Neither can it be claimed that what Holmes called 'a whip of roses' did not almost flay him alive. He, himself, tells us that his pangs were so 'grievous' that with strong crying and tears he prayed to him who was able to save him, so that neither his flesh nor spirit 'failed,' but like his Master he was heard and strengthened to endure what he feared. Surely, Dr. Palfrey's notions of law and its 'majesty' needed as much revision as did his suspicions and tender

mercies. This whipping of Holmes was as grievous a piece of tyranny as ever was inflicted at the hands of Christian men, and it can find no palliation in the divine grace vouchsafed to his spiritual support. Often when the body of a holy man is the most severely racked, his spirit seems consciously to glance aside and, as it were, stand apart from the body to exult in its own superiority to his suffering flesh. But all cynical pooh-poohment of their agonies is unworthy of a man who pretends to human consciousness. That soullessness which excuses the whipping of Holmes would justify the burning of Latimer and Ridley.

It was sufficiently painful that Dr. Palfrey should tinge the cheek of the nineteenth century by a gratuitous fling at Holmes's stripes as harmless; but it was reserved for a learned and aged minister of that lowly One who said, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me,' to select for himself the distinction of sneering at this bleeding child of God. In 1876 Rev. Dr. Dexter, in his work on Roger Williams, not only cites Palfrey's unworthy remark with approval, but on page 145 reveals an unlovely animus in doing so, by the 'sneer: 'Holmes whipped – having insisted upon it.' Palfrey might well have spared the sensibilities of Christ-like men despite the studied finish of his sentence, but much less was it needful for this venerable scholar of three-score years to wound refined humanity by studied coarseness. Though thrust out of the text, in contrast with Palfrey's words and carefully veiled in his Index, no charitable man can persuade himself that the red sores on Holmes's back would have suited the doctor's gloating better had such flowers glowed in a heap at the sufferer's feet, as in the case of Bainham. Palfrey knew that his ground was delicate and trod lightly, but to use Paul's words of Isaiah, Dr. Dexter 'is very bold,' and rushes where Palfrey 'suspected ' that he

would like to tread softly.

Without honor to Massachusetts history, and without throwing one ray of light upon this dark blot on its pages, Dr. Dexter has offered himself as the apologist of this barbarity toward his Baptist brethren, and for this purpose adopts and elaborates a most astounding theory from Dr. Palfrey. He claims that the object of this pilgrimage to Swampscott was not to administer spiritual consolation to Witter, but as he puts it, to float 'the red flag of the anabaptistical fanaticism' 'full in the face of the Bay bull.' In other words, taken from his Index again, 'Clarke and his party leave Newport to obtain a little persecution in Massachusetts,' and that to accomplish a purely political end. His statement of the case is briefly this. Some time before, Coddington, of Rhode Island, had gone to London to obtain leave from England to institute a separate government for the islands of Rhode Island and Canonicut, he to be the governor. Dr. Dexter's words are:

'In the autumn of 1650 it was understood that he was on his way home with this new instrument, and it was further understood that it was Mr. Coddington's desire and intention to bring about under it, if possible, the introduction of Rhode Island into the confederacy then existing of the other colonies, if not absolutely to prevent its annexation to Massachusetts.' Clarke and Coddington were not on good terms, and the 'Anabaptist pastor was bitterly opposed to the new-coming order of things.' 'When the crisis approached, he seems to have felt that a little persecution of the Anabaptists – if such a thing could be managed – by Massachusetts, might serve an important purpose in prejudicing the Rhode Island mind against Coddington's scheme.'

Accordingly, the visit to Witter was carefully planned and executed as a means of enraging the 'Bay bull!' [As to Roger Williams, p. 19.]

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

Possibly, Coddington had the above project in view, and he may have been opposed by Clarke; but certainly and naturally, this cruelty to Holmes raised a storm of indignation against its perpetrators. These are the only facts in addition to those of the journey itself which Dr. Dexter adduces in support of his proposition. It is one of the cardinal principles of jurisprudence that a man is to be held innocent until proved to be guilty, and that his motives are to be presumed good until shown to be evil. A Christian historian is bound to observe, at least, the same measure of just judgment that obtains in ordinary tribunals. And, no candid man will conclude that the facts recounted here are inconsistent with good intentions, or that they point to the conclusion that Holmes and his associates went to Massachusetts to carry out a political plot. One who will read Dr. Dexter's own account of this transaction with care, will see that the alleged ulterior designs are not even inferences from facts. They are supplied entirely by the writer himself, and are artfully worked into the thread of the narrative. Outside of the common presumption of innocence, the actual occurrences tend distinctly to show that the real reason of the visit to Swampscott was the one openly avowed. The conduct of the three visitors was that of men who shunned rather than courted publicity. If their purpose had been to flaunt the 'red flag full in the face of the Bay bull,' they would not have gone quietly to Witter's house and held religious service there, almost in secret. They would have made their presence and their infraction of the local law as conspicuous as possible. As it was, they were dragged from their quiet and seclusion, and forced into a public congregation against their will and remonstrance, by a constable. Then, pre-eminent amongst the three, the behavior of Holmes after the arrest was simply that of strong convictions and heroic consistency.

Whatever may be said in extenuation of the action of the Puritans of Massachusetts in this case, and it is little at the most, they were intolerant and inquisitorial. They had come to New England not to establish religious freedom, but a religious absolutism of their own. As Dr. Dexter naively puts it, they had determined 'to make their company spiritually homogeneous.' Give them the credit of being children of their age for what it is worth; but the case is entirely different with a minister of Jesus, who has breathed the air of New England for half a century, and is writing in the last quarter of the nineteenth century; who instead of asking for a charitable verdict upon their faults, seeks to justify them, in the warp and in the web, and to that end sets himself systematically to revile the dead who suffered their tyranny. His strictures show him to be so obviously the committed advocate of an untenable theory, that with all his acuteness, his dogmatizing is not even plausible. Upon him must rest the stain of having imputed to these confessors, without the slightest foundation, only wicked intentions in the performance of an act of Christian mercy. Bancroft is not alone in saying that Holmes was 'whipped unmercifully,' nor Arnold, that he was 'cruelly whipped.' Oliver, in his *Puritan Commonwealth* says that he was 'livid with the bruises from the lash,' and Gay writes in Bryant's *History of the United States*: 'Such was his spiritual exaltation that when the ghastly spectacle was over, and his clothes were restored to him to cover his scored and bloody back, he turned to the magistrates standing by, and said, "You have struck me with roses."'

A writer of the present day is no more responsible for this treatment of Baptists by the Massachusetts authorities, than were their victims, and it is honorable to the historic pen to hear men who have no special interest in those victims, beyond that of common

The American Baptists

humanity, express their honest convictions, as Mr. Winsor, Librarian of Harvard, does in his *Memorial History of Boston*. He says that the

'Anabaptists' received 'grievous treatment from the magistrates of the Puritan commonwealth...Our rulers were most perplexed and dismayed by the experience already referred to, namely, the alarming increase in the colony of unbaptized, because their parents were not members of the Church...It is a sad story. Most pure and excellent and otherwise inoffensive persons were the sufferers, and generally patient ones. But the struggle was a brief one. The Baptists conquered in it and came to equal esteem and love with their brethren. Their fidelity was one of the needful and effective influences in reducing the equally needful but effective intolerance of the Puritan commonwealth.' [I. pp. 171-9, Boston, 1880]

There is, however, a sadly ludicrous side to Dr. Dexter's showing which few care to follow. He counts Massachusetts out of his theory entirely, for he fails to show that she was in such a lovable frame of mind as to court union with Rhode Island and with her frightful 'red flag.' Whether a public proposition for the wholesale importation of vipers into the Bay Colony, or a confederation with the 'Anabaptistical fanaticism' of Rhode Island, would have most alarmed that commonwealth, it is hard to say. Bryant thinks that

'These Rhode Island people grew, from the beginning, more and more intolerable to the Boston brethren. It was bad enough that they should obstinately maintain the rights of independent thought and private conscience; it was unpardonable that they should assume to be none the less sincere Christians and good citizens, and should succeed in establishing a government of their own on principles which the Massachusetts General Court declared was criminal. Even in a common peril the Massachusetts magistrates could recognize no tie of old friendship – hardly, indeed, of human sympathy – that should bind them to

such men.' [Hist. U.S., ii, pp. 47-49]

Another aspect of this very cheap persecution theory is the jocose assumption that the Rhode Island people were obtuse and slow to learn that the 'Bay bull' ever did froth at the mouth and tear the turf in violence when he snuffed fresh breezes from the Providence plantations and Aquidneck. Sundry occasions had arisen in the schooling of the 'fanatical' colony to educate her, touching the temper of this rampant bull of Bashan. Some of her best colonists had been driven out of Massachusetts, from Williams down; and Rhode Island must have been a dull scholar indeed to have needed a 'little' new persecution to awaken her, after the lesson of November 13th, 1644.

Last of all, this theory of managing to get up 'a little persecution of the Anabaptists' to order does not accord with Clarke's acknowledged ability as a politician. To be sure he knew that old farmer Witter had been up before the Courts on the charge of being an 'Anabaptist' on two occasions – eight years before this visit and five years before – and that he had not been to the Established Church for more than 'nine months,' all of which should have shown him that the 'Bay bull' was not nearly as furious on that particular farm as in some other places. If this crafty elder had wanted to fire the Baptist heart of Rhode Island to some effect, why did he not make directly for Boston, instead of leaving it quietly; and, as he was there on Saturday, too, why did he not stay over Sunday, go to Cotton's Church, and 'flout' the flag there? Cotton would have known it in a moment, and by Monday night the roaring of the 'bull' would have traveled on the wings of the wind from Plymouth to Providence, from Boston to the horn of Cape Cod. But instead of that, he hides himself on Sunday in a Baptist family on an obscure farm two miles from a Congregational Church, will not show his face

till two constables drag him out, will not go to a Congregational Church till dragged into it, and does not act at all like a child of his generation, but altogether like an unsophisticated 'child of light.' What could the plotter be thinking of to let Mr. Cotton have peace when he was within ten miles of him, and when one wave of the 'flag' would have turned Boston into Bedlam?

Still, these three Newport evangelists might not have been so verdant, after all, as they seemed. These things appear clear to Dr. Dexter, namely: 1. They knew that the 'Bay' kept a persecuting 'bull,' with very long horns, on which to toss defenseless Baptists. 2. That it was very excitable, and a 'red' Baptist flag 'flouted full in its face' was sure to disabuse all minds that had been soothed into the dangerous belief of its loving and lamb-like disposition; but, 3. They could hardly know that it was kept on that Swampscott farm, or that it would make all Bashan tremble, by tearing up the turf generally, even when the 'red flag' was not 'flouted full in its face.' The meshes of Clarke's net are very open if these were his notions, and form an extremely thin veil for the eyes of the quick-sighted 'Bay bull.'

The entire chain of circumstances render it much more rational to interpret this visit as having in view the administration of the Lord's Supper to Witter by the authority of the Newport Church. This service, on Monday morning, throws a strong light upon the entire transaction. Backus, quoting from the Newport Church record, says that the three were 'representatives of the Church in Newport,' and that Witter 'being a brother in the Church, by reason of his advanced age, could not take so great a journey as to visit the Church.' Arnold, the Rhode Island historian, says that 'they were deputed by the Church to visit him, for he 'had requested an interview with some of his brethren,' and Holmes himself, in his letter to

Spilsbury and Kiffin, gives this account: 'I came upon occasion of business into the colony of Massachusetts with two other brethren.' On what 'business' so natural as that of their Lord and his Church, being sent as a deputation to 'break bread' with this infirm old brother, who for nearly a year had not been to the Congregational Church at Lynn, and could not get to his own at Newport.

Very early in the history of the English Reformation strong ground was taken against 'hawking about' the Lord's Supper, as an act of superstition. Bingham, in harmony with all Christian antiquity, says that in the Primitive Church, the Eucharist was not offered in a corner 'for the intention or at the cost of some particular persons, but for a communion to the whole Church, as the primitive Church always used it; and there is not an example to be found of the contrary practice.' [*Antiq.* b. xv., ch. 4, Sec. 4] But so far was this custom cast aside when the Church became corrupt, that the elements were commonly taken to the dying. According to Limborch, in Spain, soldiers and a bellman attended the procession through the streets, and when the bell gave three strokes all the people fell on their knees, even the actors and dancers on the stage, if it passed a theater [page 533]. Many reformers, therefore, deprecated the use of the Supper amongst the sick and dying, as savoring of the worst superstition. None, however, opposed this practice more resolutely than the Baptists, because they held that the Church, as a body, had control of the Supper, and should partake thereof only in its Church capacity.

In John Smyth's confession, (13) he says: 'The Church of Christ has power delegated to themselves of announcing the word, administering the sacraments,' and (15) that the Supper is the 'sign of the communion of the faithful amongst themselves.' Article XXXII, of the Baptist Confession of 1689, takes the

ground that it is 'to be observed in the Churches,' and is a 'pledge of their communion.' The Philadelphia Confession, 1742, says (Art. XXXII) that the Supper is 'to be observed in the Churches,' and deprecates 'the reserving of the elements for any pretended religious use, as contrary to the institution of Christ.' Baptists have always held that the Supper is a purely Church ordinance, the whole body partaking of the 'one loaf,' when the Church 'has come together into one place.' They have regarded it as the family feast, to indicate family relationships, and hence have always kept it strictly under the custody of the Church, their pastors celebrating it only when and where the Church appoints it to be held; the body itself determining who shall or shall not partake of it in the fraternity; as it is the Lord's table, they have ever gathered about it as a family of the Lord. In 1641 the Boston Congregational Church guarded the table so closely in this respect, that 'if any member of another Church be present, and wishes to commune, he mentions it to one of the ruling elders, "who propounds his name to the congregation," who, if having no objection, grant him the privilege.' [Felt, *Ecc. Hist.*, I, 433] Gill gives a clear statement of the Baptist position in this matter. He says of the place where it is to be celebrated:

'Not in private houses, unless when the Churches are obliged to meet there in time of persecution; but in the public place of worship, where and when the Church convened; so the disciples at Troas came together to break bread; and the Church at Corinth came together in one place to eat the Lord's Supper. Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:18-33. For this, being a Church ordinance, is not to be administered privately to single persons; but to the Church in a body assembled for that purpose.' [*Body of Div.*, iii, p. 327]

We have no reason for believing that the

Church at Newport differed from the Baptists in general on this subject, and Clarke would scarcely so far compromise his Church as to celebrate the Supper in Witter's house, if his Church had not exercised its right to control its administration by deputing him to do so, in its name and as its pastor, and by sending two laymen to accompany him as 'representatives' of the Church on the occasion; 'deputed by the Church to visit an aged member,' as Arnold expresses himself. Such a delegated authority would give weight to the expression used by Holmes also, that he went to Lynn 'upon occasion of business,' and that of importance too, being sent on the 'King's business' by the Church. So far as we have information in the case, every hint which the known facts give point in this direction, and justify Clarke in observing the Supper in Witter's house by the authority of the Church of which they were all members, and not on his own assumption.

The reaction from this cruel persecution was immediate and strongly marked. 'Thoughtful minds raised the universal inquiry: 'What evil have these men done?' Every man's conscience answered promptly: 'None at all, they have but obeyed God as they believed duty demanded; many, who had not before thought on the subject, found their attention called to the same line of duty, and, as usual, many were added to the Lord. Holmes says, that so far from his bonds and imprisonments hindering the Gospel, 'some submitted to the Lord and were baptized, and divers were put upon the way of inquiry.' Upon this state of things his second arrest was attempted, but he escaped. Henry Dunster, the President of Cambridge College (now Harvard), was so stirred in his mind, that he turned his attention to the subject of infant baptism, and soon rejected it altogether. A brief sketch of his life may be acceptable here.

He was born in England about 1612, and

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

was educated at Cambridge, with Cudworth, Milton and Jeremy Taylor. He embraced Puritan principles and came to Boston in 1640, four years after Cambridge College, New England, was established. Of course, at that time it was a mere seminary, but, being one of the most learned men of his times, he was put at its head. He devoted his great powers to its up-building, collected large sums of money for it, giving to it a hundred acres of land himself, and his success in furthering its interests was marvelous. After a scholarly and thorough examination of the question of baptism, he began to preach against infant baptism in the Church at Cambridge, 1653, to the great alarm of the whole community. For this crime he was indicted by the grand jury, was sentenced to a public admonition, put under bonds for better behavior, and compelled to resign his presidency, after a faithful service of fourteen years. Prince pronounced him 'one of the greatest masters of the Oriental languages that hath been known in those ends of the earth,' but he laid aside all his honors and positions in obedience to his convictions. His testimony against infant baptism was very strong. When forbidden to speak, he said, according to the Middlesex Court records: 'The subjects of baptism were visible penitent believers and they only.' After protesting against the christening of a child in the congregation, he said:

'There is an action now to be done which is not according to the institution of Christ. That the exposition as it had been set forth was not the mind of Christ. That the covenant of Abraham is not a ground of baptism, no, not after the institution thereof. That there were such corruptions stealing into the Church, which every faithful Christian ought to bear witness against.'

So masterly were his arguments, that Mr. Mitchel, pastor of the Church, went to labor with him, and he says that Dunster's reasons

were so 'hurrying and pressing' that he had 'a strange experience.' They were 'darted in with some impression, and left a strange confusion and sickliness upon my spirit.' So thoroughly was Mitchel shaken, that he fell back 'on Mr. Hooper's principle, that I would have an argument able to remove a mountain before I would recede from, or appear against, a truth or practice received amongst the faithful.' [*Life of Mitchel*, pp. 49-70] After Dunster had resigned his presidency, April 7th, 1657, he was arraigned before the Middlesex Court for refusing to have his child baptized. But he was firm, and gave bonds to appear before the Court of Assistants, he removed to Scituate, in the Plymouth Colony, where he maintained his manly protest. Cudworth says of him there:

'Through mercy, we have yet amongst us the worthy Mr. Dunster, whom the Lord hath made boldly to bear testimony against the spirit of persecution.'

He died February 27th, 1659, after great suffering and eminence, and in that magnanimous spirit which a man of holy conviction knows how to foster. Cotton Mather says of him, that he fell asleep

'In such harmony of affection with the good men who had been the authors of his removal from Cambridge, that he by his will ordered his body to be carried there for its burial, and bequeathed legacies to these very persons.' [*Magnalia*, b. iii, p. 367]

There is abundant proof that, in many thoughtful minds, serious doubts had arisen concerning the scriptural authority of infant baptism and the right of the secular power to interfere in religious affairs. Dunster had done much to bring about this thoughtfulness, and others went further than he seems to have gone. It was obvious to all that the rejection of infant baptism and its enforcement by law must lead to a free Church and a free State, to the casting aside of infant baptism itself as a nullity, and

the assertion of the rights of conscience and private judgment in submitting to Gospel baptism. Hence, in the very heart of the Puritan commonwealth, Dunster had planted seed which was indestructible. Cambridge and the adjoining town of Charlestown had been filled with these principles, and out of that center of influence came the first Baptist Church of Massachusetts Bay proper. For more than a generation Baptists had been struggling for a footing there, and at last it was secured. As noble a company of men as ever lived now banded together to withstand all the tyranny of the Puritan inquisition, come what might; and no body of magistrates on earth had their hands fuller of work to suppress the rights of man, than had those of that colony. The struggle was long and hard, but the triumph of manhood was complete at last. The first record on the books of the First Baptist Church in Boston reads thus:

'The 28th of the third month, 1665, in Charlestown, Massachusetts, the Church of Christ, commonly, though falsely, called Anabaptists, were gathered together, and entered into fellowship and communion with each other; engaged to walk together in all the appointments of our Lord and Master, the Lord Jesus Christ, as far as he should be pleased to make known his mind and will unto them by his word and Spirit, and then were baptized, Thomas Gould, Thomas Osborne, Edward Drinker, John George, and joined with Richard Goodall, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodall and Mary Newell, who had walked in that order in Old England, and to whom God hath since joined Isaac Hull, John Farnham, Jacob Barney, John Russell, Jr., John Johnson, George Farley, Benjamin Sweetzer, Mrs. Sweetzer, and Ellis Callender, all before 1669.'

This step, however, was not taken until the heroic band had paid a great price for their freedom, for their vexations and sufferings ran through a course of years, before the final

organization was effected. Justice to the memory of these blessed ones demands further notice of several of them. Next after the influence of Dunster on the mind of Thomas Gould, of Charlestown, a member of the Congregational Church there, the Boston Church may trace its origin to the birth of a child in Gould's family in 1655. When this little John the Baptist of Charlestown raised his first cry in that home, like Zacharias of old, its godly father called his neighbors together to unite with him in thanks to God for the precious gift. But he withheld it from baptism, and was summoned to appear before the Church to answer therefor, when still refusing to have it baptized, he was suspended from communion, December 30th, 1656. The Middlesex Court record says that he was then brought before that body 'for denying infant baptism to his child, and thus putting himself and his descendants in peril of the Lord's displeasure, as in the case of Moses.' He was brought before the same Court with Dunster, April 7th, 1657; and, worse and worse, before the Charlestown Church, February 28th, 1664, for having a meeting of 'Anabaptists' in his house on the preceding 8th of November. October 11th, 1665, he was before the Court of Assistants, charged with 'schismatical rending from the communion of the churches here, and setting up a public meeting in opposition to the ordinance of Christ.' Several other persons were tried with him for the same offense, and as they all professed their resolution yet further to proceed in such their irregular practices; thereby as well contemning the authority and laws here established for the maintenance of godliness and honesty, as continuing in the profanation of God's holy ordinances: Gould, Osborne, Drinker, Turner and George were 'disfranchised,' and threatened with imprisonment if they continued in this 'high presumption against the Lord and his holy

appointments.' Zechariah Rhodes, a Rhode Island Baptist, being in Court at the time and hearing this decision, said publicly, that 'they had not to do in matters of religion,' and was committed, but afterward admonished and dismissed.

On April 17th, 1666, Gould, Osborne and George were presented to the grand jury at Cambridge, for absence from the Congregational Church 'for one whole year.' They pleaded that they were members of a Gospel Church, and attended scriptural worship regularly. They were convicted of high presumption against the Lord and his holy appointments,' were fined £4 each, and put under bonds of £20 each; but as they would not pay their fines, they were thrown into prison. On the 18th of August, 1666, according to the General Court papers of Massachusetts, the Assistant's Court decided that Gould and Osborne might be released from prison if they would pay the fine and costs, but if not they should be banished; they also continued the injunction against the assembling of Baptists for worship. March 3d, 1668, Gould was brought before the Court of Assistants in Boston, on an appeal from the County Court of Middlesex, when the previous judgment was confirmed and he was recommitted to prison. Then, on the 7th of the same month, concluding that fines and imprisonments did nothing to win him, and having a wholesome dread of repeating the Holmes's whipping experiment, the governor and council deciding to reduce him and his brethren 'from the error of their way, and their return to the Lord,...do judge meet to grant unto Thomas Gould, John Farnham, Thomas Osborne and company yet further an opportunity of a full and free debate of the grounds for their practice.' They also appointed Rev. Messrs. Allen, Cobbett, Higginson, Danforth, Mitchel and Shepard to meet with them on the 14th of April 'in the

meeting-house at Boston at nine in the morning.' The Baptist and Pedobaptist brethren were then and there to publicly debate the following question: 'Whether it be justifiable by the word of God for these persons and their company to depart from the communion of these Churches, and to set up an assembly here in the way of Anabaptism, and whether such a practice is to be allowed by the government of this jurisdiction?' Now, who was flouting the 'red flag of the Anabaptistical fanaticism full in the face of the Bay bull?' Gould was required to inform his Baptist brethren to appear, and the Baptist Church at Newport sent a delegation of three to help their brethren in the debate. A great concourse of people assembled and Mitchel took the laboring oar in behalf of the Pedobaptists, aided stoutly by others, but after two days' denunciation of the Baptists, they were not allowed to reply. The authorities, however, claimed the victory and berated them soundly as 'schismatics' but as this did not convert them, they returned at once to the old argument of fine and imprisonment, notwithstanding many remonstrances were sent from England by such men as Drs. Goodwin and Owen, and Messrs. Mascall, Nye and Caryl. Mitchel gave this sentence against them, and that ended the matter: 'The man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die, and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.' That sentence had been pronounced in Rome a hundred times, without half the noise about it which these new-fledged inquisitors made.

It may be well to add a few words in regard to Gould's companions in this holy war. Thomas Osborne appears to have been to Gould what Silas was to Paul. As far back as November 18th, 1603, the Charlestown Church records say that he, 'being leavened with

principles of Anabaptism, and his wife leavened with the principles, of Quakerism,' that Church admonished them. But the admonition appears to have done no good, for July 9th, 1665, they were up before the Church again, with other 'Anabaptists' on the charge that they had embodied themselves in a pretended Church way.' Osborne refused to have his babe baptized, and his wife said that she could not 'conscientiously attend on ordinances with us,' and they were excommunicated on the 30th 'for their impenitency,' and on May 15th, 1675, he was fined because he worshiped with the Baptist Society, now in Boston. Edward Drinker, another of these worthies, is first heard of at Charlestown, but was not a member of the Congregational Church there, yet the Roxbury Church records say that when the Baptist Church was formed, its brethren 'prophesied in turn, some one administered the Lord's Supper, and that they held a lecture at Drinker's house once a fortnight.' This good man was baptized into the fellowship of the new Church, but was disfranchised by the Court when he became a Baptist, and was imprisoned for worshiping with his Church, 1669. He suffered much for his conscience, and we find him writing to Clarke, at Newport, as late as November 30th, 1670, in respect to the trials of the Church, which at that time had left Charlestown, and met at Noddle's Island, now East Boston. In this letter he tells Clarke that Boston and its vicinity were 'troubled,' much as Herod was at the coming of the King to Bethlehem, and especially the old Church in Boston and their elders. Indeed, he adds, that many 'gentlemen and solid Christians are for our brother's (Turner) deliverance, but it cannot be had; a very great trouble to the town; and they had gotten six magistrates' hands for his deliverance, but could not get the governor's hand to it. Some say one end is that they may

prevent others coming out of England; therefore, they would discourage them by dealing with us.' He then states that they had received several additions to the Church at Noddle's Island, that one of their elders, John Russell, lived at Woburn, where already five brethren met with him, and others in that town were embracing their opinions. William Turner and Robert Lambert were from Dartmouth, England, and were members of Mr. Stead's Church there, but became freemen in Massachusetts Bay, and were disfranchised for becoming Baptists, and when, on May 7th, 1668, the Court demanded whether Lambert would cease attending the Baptist worship, he answered that he was bound to continue in that way, and was 'ready to seal it with his blood;' he was sentenced to banishment, with Gould, Turner and Farnham. November 7th, 1669, inhabitants of Boston and Charlestown offered a petition to the Court in their favor, when ten persons were arrested for daring to sign this petition for mercy in their behalf. Most of them apologized for appearing to reflect upon the Court, but Sweetzer was fined £10, and Atwater, 5. March 2d, 1669, the magistrates liberated Gould and Turner from prison, for three days, that they might 'apply themselves' to the 'orthodox' for the 'further convincement of their many irregularities in those practices for which they were sentenced.' But in order to enjoy this chance at 'convincement' they must give good security to the prison keepers for their return to confinement. They were imprisoned because they would not move away. In November, 1671, Sweetzer writes: 'Brother Turner has been near to death, but through mercy is revived, and so has our pastor Gould. The persecuting spirit begins to stir again.' He afterward became a captain, and in a fight with the Indians on the Connecticut River. May 19th 1676, being ill, he led his troops into battle and fell at their head. He was a devout Christian,

Chapter 6 - The Boston Baptists

and beloved greatly in Boston.

These and other Baptists were forbidden again and again to hold any meetings, to which measure the General Court was moved by an address from the ciders in convention, April 30th, 1668. They say: 'Touching the case of those that set up an assembly herein the way of Anabaptism,' that it belongs to the civil magistrates to restrain and suppress these open 'enormities in religion,' and for these reasons. 'The way of Anabaptism is a known and irreconcilable enemy to the orthodox and orderly Churches of Christ.' They make 'infant baptism a nullity, and so making us all to be unbaptized persons...by rejecting the true covenant of God (Gen. 17:7-14) whereby the Church is constituted and continued, and cutting off from the Churches half the members that belong to them. Hence, they solemnly conclude that 'an assembly in the way of Anabaptism would be among us as an antitemple, an enemy in this habitation of the Lord; an anti-New England in New England, manifestly tending to the disturbance and destruction of those Churches, which their nursing fathers ought not to allow...To set up such an assembly is to set up a free school of seduction, wherein false teachers may have open liberty to seduce the people into ways of error, which may not be suffered. At the same door may all sorts of abominations come in among us, should this be allowed, for a few persons may, without the consent of our ecclesiastical and civil order, set up a society in the name of a Church, themselves being their sole judges therein; then the vilest of men and deceivers may do the like, and we have no fence nor bar to keep them out. Moreover, if this assembly be tolerated, where shall we stop? Why may we not, by the same reason, tolerate an assembly of Familists, Socinians, Quakers, Papists? yea, 'tis known that all these have elsewhere crept in under the mask of Anabaptism.'

They say that 'if this one assembly be allowed, by the same reason may a second, third, etc.; schools of them will soon be swarming hither. If once that party become numerous and prevailing, this country is undone, the work of reformation being ruined,

and the good ends and enjoyments which this people have adventured and expended so much for, utterly lost. The people of this place have a clear right to the way of religion and order that is here established, and to a freedom from all that may be disturbing and destructive thereunto.' [The Rowley Ch. Records]

After a long contest, the infant Church which had first been organized in Charlestown, and then removed to Noddle's Island, ventured to remove to Boston, and as by stealth, Philip Squire and Ellis Callender built a small meeting-house in 1679 'at the foot of an open lot running down from Salem Street to the mill-pond, and on the north side of what is now Stillman Street;' and Thomas Gould became the first pastor. This building was so small, plain and unpretending, that it did not disturb the 'Bay bull' until it was completed, and the Church entered it for worship, February 15th. Then that amiable animal awoke and played very violent antics, without the aid of Clarke's 'red flag.' In May, the General Court passed a law forbidding a house for public worship without the consent of the Court or a town-meeting, on forfeiture of the house and land. Under this *post facto* law the Baptists declined to occupy their own church edifice until the king, Charles II, required the authorities to allow liberty of conscience to all Protestants. Then the Baptists went back again, for which the Court arraigned them, and March 8th, 1680, ordered the marshal to nail up the doors, which he did, posting the following notice on the door:

'All persons are to take notice that, by order of the Court, the doors of this house are shut up, and that they are inhibited to hold any meetings therein, or to open the doors thereof, without license from authority, till the Court take further order, as they will answer the contrary to their peril.

'EDWARD RAWSON, Secretary.'

The Baptists quietly petitioned in May,

The American Baptists

asking the right to eat their own bread, and the Court gave them this stone, prohibiting them, 'as a society by themselves, or joined with others, to meet in that public place they have built, or any public place except such as are allowed by lawful authority.' The Baptists did not break open the door, but held their public Sunday services on the first Sabbath in the yard, and then prepared a shed for that on the second Sabbath. But when they came together

they found the doors open! Never stopping to ask whether the marshal had opened them or the angel which threw back the iron gate to Peter, they went in boldly and said: 'The Court had not done it legally, and that we were denied a copy of the constable's order and marshal's warrant, we concluded to go into our house, it being our own, having a civil right to it.' Since that day there has always been a 'great door and effectual' opened to Boston Baptists.

Chapter 7 - New Centers of Baptist Influence – South Carolina – Maine – Pennsylvania – New Jersey

As a wrathful tempest scatters seed over a continent, so persecution has always forced Baptists where their wisdom had not led them. The first American Baptist that we hear of, out of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, is in a letter which Humphrey Churchwood, a resident of what is now Kittery, Maine, addressed January 3d, 1682, to the Baptist Church in Boston, of which he was a member. He states that there were at Kittery 'a competent number of well-established people, whose heart the Lord had opened, who desired to follow Christ and to partake of all his holy ordinances.' They asked, therefore, that a Baptist Church should be established there, with William Screven as pastor, who went to Boston and was ordained. Before he returned to Kittery, Churchwood and others of the little band were summoned before the magistrates and threatened with fines if they continued to hold meetings. A Church was organized, however, September 25th, 1682. So bitterly did the Standing Order oppose this Baptist movement, that Mr. Screven and his associates resolved to seek an asylum elsewhere, and a promise to this effect was given to the magistrates. It is supposed that they left Kittery not long after the organization of the Church, but it is certain from the province records, that this 'Baptist Company' were at Kittery as late as October 9th, 1683; for under that date in the records of a Court occurs an entry from which it appears that Mr. Screven was brought before the Court for 'not departing this province according to a former confession of Court and his own choice.'

At the Court held at Wells, May 27th, 1684, this action was taken: 'An order to be sent for William Screven to appear before ye General Assembly in June next.' As no further record in reference to Mr. Screven appears, it is probable that he and his company were on their way to

their new home in South Carolina before the General Assembly met. They settled on the Cooper River, not far from the present city of Charleston. Some of the early colonists of South Carolina were Baptists from the west of England, and it is very likely that these two bands from New and Old England formed a new Church, as it is certain that, in 1685, both parties became one Church on the west bank of the Cooper River, which was removed to Charleston by the year 1693, and which was the first Baptist Church in the South. In 1699 this congregation became strong enough to erect a brick meetinghouse and a parsonage on Church Street, upon a lot of ground which had been given to the body. It is not known whether the church at Kittery was dissolved or whether it was transferred to South Carolina. Certainly no church organization intractable there after the departure of Mr. Screven and his company.

Nearly a century passed before we find another Baptist church within the limits of what is now the State of Maine. Then, as the result of the labors of Rev. Hezekiah Smith, of Haverhill, Mass., a Baptist church was organized in Berwick and another in Gorham. Four years later, in Sanford, still another church was organized. In April, 1776, William Hooper was ordained pastor of the church in Berwick. This was the first ordination of a Baptist minister in the District of Maine. In Wells, in 1780, a fourth church was organized, of which Nathaniel Lord was ordained pastor. All of these churches were in the south-western part of Maine and became connected with the New Hampshire Baptist Association.

In 1782 Rev. Job Macomber, of Middleboro, Mass., visited the District of Maine. Hearing of a religious interest in Lincoln County, he made his way thither in December and engaged in the work. In January,

The American Baptists

1783, he wrote a letter to Rev. Isaac Backus of Middleboro, in which he gave an account of his labors. This letter Mr. Backus read to Mr. Isaac Case, who was so impressed with the need of more laborers in that destitute field, that in the autumn of 1783, after having been ordained, he made his way into the District of Maine, he preached awhile in the vicinity of Brunswick and then visited Thomaston, where, May 27, 1784, as a result of his labors, there was organized a church, of which he became pastor. Three days earlier a church was organized in Bowdoinham, and Rev. Job Macomber was soon after called to the pastorate. January 19, 1785, a church was organized in Harpswell, and Mr. James Potter, who had labored in that place with Rev. Isaac Case, was ordained as its pastor. May 24, 1787, these three pastors, with delegates from their churches, organized the Bowdoinham Association in the house of Mr. Macomber, at Bowdoinham. Mr. Case was made moderator of the association, and Mr. Potter preached the first sermon. In 1789 three more churches and one ordained minister had been added to the association. In 1790 the number of Baptist churches in the District of Maine was 11, with about 500 members. In 1797, ten years after its organization, Bowdoinham Association comprised 26 churches, 17 ordained ministers and 1,088 members. The Lincoln Association, embracing 18 churches, chiefly east of the Kennebec River, was organized in 1805.

It was during this year that Rev. Daniel Merrill, pastor of the Congregationalist church in Sedgwick, became a Baptist, together with a large number of his former parishioners. He was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1789, and his church was one of the largest in the District of Maine, he thought he would write a book against the Baptists, but his study of the Scriptures convinced him that they were right and that he was wrong. He at length called the

members of his church together for consultation, and they asked him to give them the results of his investigations. He preached seven sermons on baptism, and not long after a Baptist church was organized of which Mr. Merrill became pastor. His sermons on baptism were published and in successive editions were extensively circulated. Mr. Merrill performed valuable missionary service also, and in various ways greatly advanced the Baptist cause in Maine.

The Cumberland Association was organized in 1811, York Association in 1819, and the Eastern Maine Association in 1819. In 1826 there were in Maine 199 churches, 126 ordained ministers, and 12,120 members. That year the Penobscot Association was organized. Waldo and Oxford followed in 1829; Kennebec in 1830; Hancock in 1835; Washington in 1836; Piscataquis in 1839; Saco River in 1842; and Damariscotta in 1843. No new associations have been formed since that time. There are now in Maine 247 Baptist churches, 144 ordained ministers, and 19,871 members.

The Baptists of Maine have at Waterville a flourishing college – Colby University, with an endowment of over \$550,000, and also three endowed preparatory schools, namely, Gubern Classical Institute, at Waterville; Hebron Academy, at Hebron, and Ricker Classical Institute, at Moulton. The Maine Baptist Missionary Convention, the Maine Baptist Education Society, and the Maine Baptist Charitable Society are strong and efficient organizations.

It now fell to the lot of Rhode Island to send forth new Baptist influence into the then distant colony of Pennsylvania. In 1684, three years after William Penn obtained his charter from Charles II, Thomas Dungan, an aged and zealous Baptist minister, removed from Rhode Island to Cold Spring, Bucks County, Pa., on the Delaware River, and gathered a Church

there, which maintained a feeble life until 1702. Thomas Dungan came from Ireland to Newport, in consequence of the persecution of the Baptists there under Charles II, and appears to have been a most lovable man, whom Keach characterizes as 'an ancient disciple and teacher amongst the Baptists.' He attracted a number of influential families around him, and it is believed that the father of the noted Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a member of his Church at Cold Spring. William Penn, it is supposed, caught his liberal views from Algernon Sidney; he had suffered much for Christ's sake, and had adopted quite broad views of religious liberty; for at the very inception of legislation in Pennsylvania, the Assembly had passed the 'Great Law,' the first section of which provides that in that jurisdiction no person shall

'At any time be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place or ministry whatever, contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his or her Christian liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflection; and, if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice, in matter of religion, such shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly.' [Janney's *Life of Penn*, p. 211]

This provision scarcely matched, however, the radical position of Rhode Island, which provided for the absolute non-interference of government in religion. Hepworth Dixon tells us that the first Pennsylvania Legislature, at Chester, 1682, decided That 'every Christian man of twenty-one years of age, unstained by crime, should be eligible to elect or be elected a member of the Colonial Parliament.' Here, to begin, was a religious test of office and even of the popular franchise, for no one but Christians could either vote for public officers or serve in

the Legislature. The laws agreed upon in England by Penn, and the freemen who came with him, restricted toleration to 'all persons who confess and acknowledge the one Almighty and Eternal God to be the Creator, Upholder and 'Ruler of the world.' The Church at Cold Spring, located between Bristol and Trenton, was protected under these laws, but it seems to have died with Mr. Dungan in 1688, or rather to have lived at a dying rate, for in 1702 it disbanded, and Morgan Edwards, writing in 1770, says That nothing was left there in his day but a grave-yard bearing the names of the Dungans, Gardners, Woods, Doyls and others, who were members of this Church.

In 1687 a company of Welsh and Irish Baptists crossed the Atlantic and settled at Lower Dublin, Pa., otherwise called Pemmepeka, Pennepek or Pennypack, a word of the Delaware Indians which signifies, according to Heckewelder, a 'pond, lake or bay; water not having a current.' This company organized a Baptist Church, built a meeting-house near the water bearing this name, and sent forth its influence all through Pennsylvania, also into New Jersey and New York, Delaware and Maryland, as its pastors preached in these colonies. Its records were kept with care from the first, and are still preserved in a large folio. We are indebted to Hon. Horatio Gates Jones for the following and many other interesting tenets. The records state:

'By the good providence of God, there came certain persons out of Radnorshire, in Wales, over into tills Province of Pennsylvania, and settled in the township of Dublin, in the County of Philadelphia, namely, John Eaton, George Eaton and Jane, his wife, Samuel Jones and Sarah Eaton, who had all been baptized upon confession of faith, and received into the communion of the Church of Christ meeting in the parishes of Llandewi and Nantmel, in Radnorshire, Henry Gregory

The American Baptists

being chief pastor. Also John Baker, who had been baptized, and a member of a congregation of baptized believers in Kilkenny, in Ireland, Christopher Blackwell pastor, was, by the providence of God, settled in the township aforesaid. In the year 1687 there came one Samuel Vans out of England, and settled near the aforesaid township and went under the denomination of a Baptist, and was so taken to be.' These, with Sarah Eaton, 'Joseph Ashton and Jane, his wife, William Fisher, John Watts' and Rev. Elias Keach, formed the Church. Samuel Vans was chosen deacon and was 'with laying on of hands ordained 'by Elias Keach, who 'was accepted and received for our pastor, and we sat down in communion at the Lord's table.'

Ashton and his wife, with Fisher and Watts, had been baptized by Keach at Pennepek, November, 1687, and 'in the month of January, 1687-88 (O. S.), the Church was organized, 198 years ago, and remains to this day.' Hereby hangs a very interesting story concerning Keach, showing who and what he was.

Elias Keach came to this country in 1686, a year before this Church was formed. He was the son of Benjamin Keach, of noble memory, for endurance of the pillory, and for the authorship of a key to Scripture metaphors and an exposition of all the parables. When Elias arrived in Pennsylvania, he was a wild scamp of nineteen, and for sport dressed like a clergyman. His name and appearance soon obtained invitations for him to preach, as a young divine from London. A crowd of people came to hear him, and concluding to brave the thing out he began to preach, but suddenly stopped short in his sermon. There was a stronger muttering than he had counted on in the heart which had caught its life from its honored father and mother, despite the black coat and white bands under which it beat. He was alarmed at his own boldness, stopped short, and the little flock at Lower Dublin thought him seized with sudden illness. When asked for the

cause of his fear he burst into tears, confessed his imposture and threw himself upon the mercy of God for the pardon of all his sins. Immediately he made for Cold Spring to ask the counsel of Thomas Dungan, who took him lovingly by the hand, led him to Christ, and when they were both satisfied of his thorough conversion he baptized him; and his Church sent the young evangelist forth to preach Jesus and the resurrection. Here we see how our loving God had brought a congregation of holy influences together from Ireland and Wales, Rhode Island and England, apparently for the purpose of forming the ministry of the first great pastor in our key-stone State. Keach made his way back to Pennepek, where he began to preach with great power. The four already named were baptized as the first-fruits of his ministry, then he organized the Church and threw himself into his Gospel work with consuming zeal. He traveled at large, preaching at Trenton, Philadelphia, Middletown, Cohansey, Salem and many other places, and baptized his converts into the fellowship of the Church at Pennepek, so that all the Baptists of New Jersey and Pennsylvania were connected with that body, except the little band at Cold Spring.

Morgan Edwards tells us that twice a year, May and October, they held 'General Meetings' for preaching and the Lord's Supper, at Salem in the spring and at Dublin or Burlington in the autumn, for the accommodation of distant members and the spread of the Gospel, until separate Churches were formed in several places. When Mr. Keach was away, the Church held meetings at Pennepek, and each brother exercised what gifts he possessed, the leading speakers generally being Samuel Jones and John Watts. Keach married Mary, the daughter of Chief-Justice Moore, of Pennsylvania, and the Church prospered until 1689, when they must needs fall into a pious jangle about 'laying

Chapter 7 - New Centers of Baptist Influence – South Carolina – Maine – Pennsylvania – New Jersey

on of hands in the reception of members after baptism, predestination and other matters.' Soon after, Keach brought his pastoral work to a close in 1689, and returned to London, where he organized a Church in Ayles Street, Goodman's Fields, preached to great crowds of people, and in nine months baptized 130 into its fellowship. He published several works, amongst them one on the 'Grace of Patience,' and died in 1701, at the age of thirty-four. The Pennepek Church, after some contentions, built its first meeting-house in 1707, on ground presented by Rev. Samuel Jones, who became one of its early pastors; for many years it was the center of denominational operations west of the Connecticut River, and from its labors sprang the Philadelphia Association, in 1707. It was natural that the several Baptist companies formed in different communities by this Church should soon take steps for the organization of new Churches in their several localities, and this was first done in New Jersey, in Middletown in 1688, Piscataqua in 1689, and Cohansey in 1690.

Next to Rhode Island, NEW JERSEY had peculiar attractions for Baptists. It had been ceded to Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, by the Duke of York, in 1664, and in honor of Sir George, who had held the Isle of Jersey as a Royalist Governor of Charles II, it was called New Jersey.

In the 'Grants and Concessions of New Jersey,' made by Berkeley and Carteret, published in 1665, religious freedom was guaranteed thus: 'No person at any time shall be any ways molested, punished, disquieted or called in question for any difference in opinion or practice in matters of religious concernments.' [Leaming and Spicer, p. 14, 1664-1702] The religious freedom of Rhode Island seemed to be as broad as possible, yet, because that colony required all its citizens to

bear arms, some Quakers were unwilling to become freemen there, but under these grants they went to New Jersey and became citizens. From the first, therefore, New Jersey was pre-eminent for its religious liberty, so that Baptists, Quakers and Scotch Covenanters became the permanent inhabitants of the new colony. Many of them came from Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and New York, for the two lords' proprietors dispatched messengers to all the colonies proclaiming the liberal terms of the grants.

Richard Stout, with five others, had settled in Middletown as early as 1648, and Obadiah Holmes, the confessor at Boston, had become one of the patentees of Monmouth County. It is certain that some of the Middletown settlers emigrated from Rhode Island and Long Island as early as 1665. Amongst the original patentees, James Ashton, John Bowne, Richard Stout, Jonathan Holmes, James Grover and others were Baptists. There is some evidence That John Bowne was an unordained preacher, the first preacher to the new colony. Obadiah Holmes was one of the patentees of the Monmouth tract, 1665, owning house lot No. 20 and hill lot No. 6. He never lived in East Jersey, but his son Jonathan did from 1667-80. Obadiah Jr., was on Staten Island in 1689, but in 1690 he resided in Salem County, West Jersey. Jonathan was a member of the Assembly of East Jersey in 1668, and lived in Middletown for about ten years. About 1680 he returned to Rhode Island. His will, made in 1705, is on record at Newport, R.I., under date of November 5th, 1713, and is also recorded at Newton, N.J. He died in 1715. His sons, Obadiah and Jonathan, grandsons of the Boston sufferer, were members of the Middletown Baptist Church, and their descendants are still numerous in Monmouth County. It is very likely that these early Baptists had first taken

The American Baptists

refuge at Gravesend, Long Island, N.Y. Public worship was early observed in Middletown, and some of them had connected themselves with the Pennepek Church, because, after consultation with that body, they 'settled themselves into a Church state' in 1688. About 1690 Elias Keach lived and preached amongst them for nearly a year. This interest prospered until the close of the century, when they fell into a quarrel, divided into two factions, which mutually excluded each other and silenced their pastors, John Bray and John Okison. After a good round fight about doctrine, as set forth in their Confession and Covenant, they called a council of Churches May 25th, 1711, which advised them to 'continue the silence imposed on the two brethren the preceding year,' 'to sign a covenant relative to their future conduct,' and 'to bury their proceedings in oblivion and erase the record of them.' Twenty-six would not do this, but forty-two signed the covenant, and, as four leaves are torn out of the Church book, we take it that they went into the 'oblivion' of fire. What became of the twenty-six nobody seemed to care enough to tell us; it may be lovingly hoped that, quarrelsome as they were, they escaped the fate of the four leaves, both in this world and in that which is to come.

A most interesting Church was organized in 1689 at Piscataqua. This settlement was named after a settlement in New Hampshire (now Dover), which at that time was in the Province of Maine. We have seen that Hanserd Knollys preached there in 1638-41, and had his controversy with Larkham respecting receiving all into the Church (Congregational), and the baptizing of any infants offered. Although Knollys was not a Baptist at that time, his discussions on these subjects proved to be the seed which yielded fruit after many years. In 1648, ten years after he began his ministry at Dover, under date of October 18th, the authorities of the day were informed that the

profession of 'Anabaptistry' there by Edward Starbuck had excited much trouble, and they appointed Thomas Wiggin and George Smith to try his case. Starbuck was one of the assistants in the Congregational Church there, possibly the same people to whom Knollys had preached; but the results of the trial, if he had one, are not given. The Colonial records of Massachusetts make the authorities say (iii, p. 173):

'We have heard heretofore of divers Anabaptists risen up in your jurisdiction and connived at. Being but few, we well hoped that it might have pleased God, by the endeavors of yourselves and the faithful elders with you, to have reduced such erring men again into the right way. But now, to our great grief, we are credibly informed that your patient bearing with such men hath produced another effect, namely, the multiplying and increasing of the same errors, and we fear may be of other errors also if timely care be not taken to suppress the same. Particularly we understand that within these few weeks there have been at Seckonk thirteen or fourteen persons rebaptized (a swift progress in one town), yet we hear not if any effectual restriction is intended thereabouts.'

When Knollys left, in 1641, a number of those who sympathized with his Baptist tendencies left with him, and when he returned to London they settled on Long Island, and remained there until that territory fell under the power of English Episcopacy, when they removed to the vicinity of New Brunswick, N.J. There they formed the settlement of Piscataqua (afterward Piscataway, near Stelton) and organized a Baptist Church, which has exerted a powerful influence down to this time, being now under the pastoral care of John Wesley Sarles, D.D. The constituent members of this Church form an interesting study. It is certain that amongst the original patentees, in 1666, Hugh Dunn and John Martin were Baptists, and

amongst their associates admitted in 1668 the Drakes, Dunhams, Smalleys, Bonhams, Fitz Randolphs, Mannings, Runyons, Stelles and others were of the same faith. About the time of organizing the Baptist Church at 'New Piscataqua,' as they called the place, the township confined about 80 families, embodying a population of about 400 persons. From the earliest information this settlement was popularly known as the 'Anabaptist Town,' and from 1675 downward the names of members of the Baptist Church are found amongst the law-makers and other public officials, both in the town and the colony, showing that they were prominent and influential citizens. Their connection with Pennepek was slight, yet some of the families of the old Church may have been in the new. Amongst them were John Drake, Hugh Dunn and Edmund Dunham, unordained ministers, who had labored for several years in that region as itinerants. About six years before the formation of the Church – 1685-90 – a company of Irish Baptists, members of a Church in Tipperary, had landed at Perth Amboy and made a settlement at Cohansey, some of whom went farther into the interior. It is quite probable that Dunn and Dunham – were both of that company, and quite as likely that Mr. Drake was from Dover, N.H., where it is believed that his father had settled many years before from Devonshire, England. Thomas Killingsworth also was present at the organization of this Church, but John Drake, whose family claims kindred with Sir Francis Drake, the great navigator, was ordained its pastor at its constitution, and served it in that capacity for about fifty years.

Another Church was established at COHANSEY. The records of this Church for the first hundred years of its existence were burned, but, according to Asplund's Register,

the Church was organized in 1691. Keach had baptized three persons there in 1688, and the Church was served for many years by Thomas Killingsworth, who was also a judge on the bench. He was an ordained minister from Norfolk, England, of much literary ability, eminent for his gravity and sound judgment, and so was deemed fit to serve as Judge of the County Court of Salem. About 1687 a company had come from John Myles's Church, at Swansea, near Providence, which for twenty-three years kept themselves as a separate Church, on the questions of laying on of hands, singing of psalms and predestination, until, with Timothy Brooks, their pastor they united with their brethren at Cohansey.

It was meet that before this remarkable century closed the nucleus of Baptist principles should be formed in the great Quaker city of Philadelphia, and this was done in 1696. John Fanner and his wife, from Knolly's Church in London, landed there in that year, and were joined in 1697 by John Todd and Rebecca Woosencroft, from the Church at Leamington, England. A little congregation was held in Philadelphia by the preaching of Keach and Killingsworth and slowly increased. The meetings were held irregularly in a store-house on what was known as the 'Barbadoes Lot,' at the corner of what are now called Second and Chestnut Streets, and formed a sort of out-station to Pennepek. In 1697 John Watts baptized four persons, who, with five others, amongst them John Hohne, formed a Church on the second Sabbath in December, 1698. They continued to meet in the store-house till 1707, when they were compelled to leave under protest, and then they worshiped, according to Edwards, at a place 'near the draw-bridge, known by the name of Anthony Morris's New House.' They were not entirely independent of Pennepek till 1723, when they had a dispute

The American Baptists

with the Church there about certain legacies, in which the old Church wanted to share; May 15th, 1746, this contest resulted in the formation of an entirely independent Church of fifty-six members in Philadelphia.

This rapid review of the Baptist sentiment which had shaped into organization in these colonies at the close of the seventeenth century, together with a few small bodies in Rhode Island, besides the Churches at Providence and Newport, Swansea, South Carolina and New Jersey, give us the results of more than half a century's struggle for a foothold in the New World. The new century, however, opened with the emigration of sixteen Baptists, from the counties of Pembroke and Carmarthen, Wales, under the leadership of Rev. Thomas Griffith, whose coming introduced a new era in Pennsylvania and the region round about. They had organized themselves into what Morgan Edwards calls 'a Church emigrant and sailant' at Milford, June, 1701, and landed in Philadelphia in September following. They repaired immediately to the vicinity of Pennepek and settled there for a time. They insisted on the rite of laying on of hands as a matter of vital importance, and fell into sharp contention on the subject, both amongst themselves and with the Pennepek Church. In 1703 the greater part of them purchased lands containing about 30,000 acres from William Penn, in Newcastle County, Delaware. This they named the Welsh Tract and removed thither. There they prospered greatly from year to year, adding to their numbers both by emigration and conversion. But they say:

'We could not be in fellowship (at the Lord's table) with our brethren of Pennepek and Philadelphia, because they did not hold to the laying on of hands; true, some of them believed in the ordinance, but neither preached it up nor practiced it, and when we moved to Welsh Tract, and left twenty-two of our

members at Pennepek, and took some of theirs with us, the difficulty increased.'

For about seventy years their ministers were Welshmen, some of them of eminence, and six Churches in Pennsylvania and Delaware trace their lineage to this Church. As early as 1736 it dismissed forty-eight members to emigrate to South Carolina, where they made a settlement on the Peedee River, and organized the Welsh Neck Church there, which during the next century became the center from which thirty-eight Baptist Churches sprang, in the immediate vicinity.

Humanly speaking, we can distinctly trace the causes of our denominational growth from the beginning of the century to the opening of the Revolutionary War. In the Churches west of the Connecticut there was an active missionary spirit. At first the New England Baptists partook somewhat of the conservatism of their Congregational brethren, but in the Churches planted chiefly by the Welsh in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Virginia, the missionary spirit was vigorous and aggressive. As from a central fortress they sent out their little bands; here a missionary and there a handful of colonists, who penetrated farther into the wilderness, and extended the frontiers of the denomination. Two men are deservedly eminent in thus diffusing our principles, namely, Abel Morgan and Hezekiah Smith. These are fair types of the Baptist ministry of their day, and their work is largely representative of the labors of many others.

Abel Morgan was born at Welsh Tract, April 18th, 1713. To prevent confusion of names here, it may be well to state, that the first Welsh minister of this name was born in Wales in 1673, came to America and became pastor of the Pennepek Church in 1711, and died therein 1722. Enoch Morgan was his brother, born in Wales, 1676; he also came to this country and became pastor of the Church at Welsh Tract,

where he died in 1740. The Abel Morgan, therefore, of whom we now speak was Enoch Morgan's son, named after his uncle Abel, pastor at Pennepek. The subject of this sketch was one of the leading minds of his day. He was trained by Rev. Thomas Evans, at the Pencader Academy, and was familiar with the languages. He was ordained in the Welsh Tract Church, 1734, and became pastor of the Middletown Baptist Church, New Jersey, in 1739, which he served until his death, in 1785. He bequeathed his library to this Church for the use of his successors, and many notes in his hand are written upon the margins of the volumes in Welsh and Latin. Rev. Samuel Finley, who became President of Princeton College, being disturbed by the growth of the Baptists, challenged him to a discussion. Finley wrote his *Charitable Plea for the Speechless*, and Morgan replied in his 'Anti-Paedo Rantism; or, Mr. Samuel Finley's Charitable Plea for the Speechless examined and refuted, the Baptism of Believers maintained, and the mode of it by Immersion vindicated.' This treatise was printed at Philadelphia by Benjamin Franklin, 1747. He had another controversy with Rev. Samuel Harker, a Presbyterian, of Kingswood. His work exhibits careful and thorough scholarship, and the appreciation of his brethren is shown by the fact that he was the first to receive the honorary degree of M.A. from Brown University. In his disputation with Finley quite as much Welsh fire was kindled on the one side as good old Scotch obstinacy on the other; and Morgan did great service in setting forth the scriptural and logical consistency of the Baptist position. In 1772 Abel Morgan served as moderator of the Philadelphia Association, James Manning being clerk. Morgan had been clerk in 1762, and in 1774 it was on his motion that the Association adopted the use of the Circular Letter.

But his great life-work is found in preaching the Gospel. During his pastorate of forty years, in a sparse population, his Church received fully 300 persons into its fellowship upon their confession of Christ. He held regular services in two Middletown meeting-houses, several miles apart, besides preaching often at Freehold, Upper Freehold, and Long Brand, making the whole of Monmouth County his parish. Besides this he made extensive circuits into Pennsylvania and Delaware, preaching the word, as a burning and shining light.

Rev. Hezekiah Smith is another name to be had in everlasting remembrance. He was born on Long Island on the 21st of April, 1737, was baptized at the age of nineteen by Rev. John Gano, and in 1762 was graduated from the College of New Jersey, at Princeton. Immediately on graduating he set out on a horseback journey through the South, preaching the Gospel for fifteen months as he traveled from place to place. On the 20th of September, 1763, he was publicly ordained at Charleston, S.C., for the work of the Christian ministry. In the spring of 1764, having accompanied Manning to Rhode Island, he set out on a second missionary journey, this time to the East through Massachusetts, he arrived at Haverhill, and for a time preached in a Congregational Church in the West Parish, then without a pastor. His piety and eloquence attracted crowds of hearers, many of whom were converted, and in due time he was waited upon by a committee of the Church with a view to permanent settlement. Under these circumstances he was obliged to tell them frankly that he was a Baptist, which information not only abruptly closed his labors in that parish, but led to his persecution on the part of the Standing Order. His friends, however, including some leading citizens, pressed him to form a Baptist Church in the

center of the town. After consulting with his spiritual advisers in Rhode Island, New York, and New Jersey, he finally consented, and the Church was constituted May 9th, 1765, and he remained its pastor for forty years. The memoirs of Dr. Smith, based on his journals, letters and addresses, have been prepared by Dr. Guild and recently published. They furnish a reliable history of the times in which he lived, and afford a charming insight into his daily life. Further reference will be made to him as a prominent chaplain in the army of the Revolution.

In point of self-denying and restless labor, these two men were fair representatives of scores of Baptist ministers, North and South, who served one or two Churches near their homes, but who traveled, generally on horseback, through woods and glades, mountains and plains, in search of lost men. They preached where they could, in house or barn, in forests or streets, gathering the scattered few in remote districts, leading them to Jesus, baptizing and organizing them into Churches. Generally their fame drew the people together throughout an extensive circle, in many instances persons coming from five and twenty to sixty miles to hear them, many of them never having heard any tiling that approached the warm and simple unfolding of the riches of Christ. Dwellers in log cabins, wooded mountains, the dense wilderness and the broad vales, were gathered into living Churches which still abide as monuments of grace.

The formation of Associations was another element which contributed to Baptist success. At first, in many places, these began in simple annual meetings for religious exercises simply, but they naturally drifted into organic bodies including other objects as well. The Baptists were very jealous of them, fearing that they might trench on the independency of the

Churches and come in time to exercise authority after the order of presbyteries, instead of confining themselves to merely fraternal aims. This has always been the tendency in the voluntary bodies of Christian history, and for this reason Associations will bear close watching at all times, as they are simply human in their origin. The original safeguard against this tendency was found in our colonial times in the fact that, except as the Churches met in Association for the purpose of helping each other to resist the oppressions of the State, they transacted no business. The cluster of Churches grouped around Philadelphia were strongly bound together by common interests, particularly as Baptist mission work extended in that part of our land. As early as 1688 general quarterly meetings had been held at the different Churches for mutual encouragement, but there was no representation of these Churches by delegates. In 1707 the Pennepek, Middletown, Piscataqua, Cohansey and Welsh Tract Churches appointed representatives and formed the Philadelphia Association. At that time the Philadelphia congregation was a branch of the Church at Pennepek (Lower Dublin); hence its name does not appear in the list of the Churches; still the name of the largest town was chosen. The essential principles controlling this body were these, with some exception, that regulated the English Churches which met in London, September, 1689. The London body adopted thirty-two Articles as a Confession of Faith. An Appendix was also issued, but not as a part of the Articles, in which these words are used, partly in explanation of the position held by the English Churches on the subject of communion:

'Divers of us who have agreed in this Confession cannot hold Church communion with any other than baptized believers, and Churches constituted of such; yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our

spirits that way; and therefore we have purposely omitted the mention of things of that nature, that we might concur in giving this evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves and with other good Christians.'

Dr. Rippon gave the Minutes and Articles of the Assembly in his Register closing with 1793, but omits the Appendix, as also does Crosby, clearly not considering this a part of the Articles nor of equal authority with them, while some of the members were open communists. The Philadelphia Confession consists of thirty-four Articles, the twenty-third being in favor of singing in public worship, and the thirty-first in favor of the laying on of hands after baptism. There were some other changes, but slight, and the publication of the Confession was accompanied by a forceful Dissertation on Church Discipline. The Philadelphia Association adopted this September 25th, 1742, and it will be of interest to say that the first edition was printed by Benjamin Franklin in 1743. The foregoing extract taken from the London Appendix is not found in the Philadelphia document, as all the Churches which adopted it there were strict communion in their practice; hence they never accepted the London Appendix, but use these words on the Communion question in the XXXI, one of the new Articles: 'We believe that laying on of hands, with prayer, upon baptized believers as such, is an ordinance of Christ and ought to be submitted unto by all such persons that are admitted to partake of the Lord's Supper.' This Confession became the basis on which almost all the Associations of this country were established, until what is called the New Hampshire Confession was drawn up by the late Dr. John Newton Brown.

The value of this Association to the encouragement and maintenance of new Churches is indicated by Morgan Edwards, who

says, in 1770, that from the five Churches which constituted it, it had 'so increased since as to contain thirty-four Churches, exclusive of those which have been detached to form another Association.' Its Confession, as a whole, takes the doctrinal ground denominated Moderate Calvinism, as laid down by Andrew Fuller, carefully avoiding all extremes, especially that known as Hyper-Calvinism. The many subdivisions into which these were divided who practiced the immersion of believers, but created tests of fellowship not known to the Churches of the New Testament, found scant comfort in the unmistakable language of this Confession. The scriptural character of its positions, with the freedom of thought which it left to the Churches on matters not comprised in its Articles, armed it with a powerful moral influence against heterodoxy, and yet left that free scope for the exercise of conscience without which Baptists cannot exist. A like service was rendered by its Treatise of Discipline, which aided the Churches in administering their practices, with such variations as their circumstances of time and place dictated; and, without that crippling effect which Romanism has sometimes assumed in Baptist Churches under the monstrous guise of Baptist usage, which, in other words, simply meant Baptist tradition.

The establishment of this Association formed a great epoch in Baptist history, because it fostered those educational and philanthropic causes which needed the co-operation of the sisterhood of Churches, and could not be sustained by purely separate congregations. When Isaac Eaton had it upon his heart to raise an academy in connection with his Church at Hopewell, N.J., the Philadelphia Association passed the following resolution, October 5th, 1756: 'Concluded to raise a sum of money toward the encouragement of a Latin Grammar

School, for the promotion of learning amongst us, under the care of Rev. Isaac Eaton, and the inspection of our brethren, Abel Morgan, Isaac Stelle, Abel Griffith and Peter P. Van Horn.' It is said that the first student at this academy was James Manning, afterward President of Brown University. Samuel Jones and Hezekiah Smith were also amongst the early students, as well as Samuel Stillman, John Gano, Charles Thompson, Judge Howell, Benjamin Stelle, and many others of note, both in Church and State. So many of the Churches were supplied with able pastors from this seminary that the Baptists were moved to establish a college, and the result of their effort was the founding of that noted seat of learning now known as Brown University. In a sense, the Philadelphia, aided by the Charleston and Warren Associations, gave birth to all the Baptist institutions of learning in America by nursing the enterprise at Hopewell. The encouragement and assistance which persecuted Baptists received in other States from these Associations in relation to religious freedom was very great. We have seen that the Philadelphia Association was formed in 1707; then followed the Charleston, S.C., in 1751; the Kehukee, N.C., in 1765; and the Warren, R.I., in 1767. When the Warren Association was formed, there were, according to Backus, fifty-five Baptist Churches in New England, but according to Morgan Edwards there were seventy. Some of them observed the Sabbath on the seventh day, some were frankly Arminian in doctrine, and a majority of them maintained the imposition of hands upon the immersed as a divine ordinance.

As early as 1729 the General or Arminian Baptists formed an Association at Newport, R.I., and in 1730 thirteen Churches of that colony and Connecticut held yearly meetings upon the Six Principles. The associational idea was thus early at work, but the Warren Association did not grow out of this previous

organization. Nor was it related to the quarterly and yearly meetings, as was the Philadelphia body, the Churches which formed it each working on their own lines for a long time. The idea of an association between the Calvinistic Baptist Churches of New England probably originated with Dr. Manning. The growth of our Churches in Massachusetts and the founding of Brown University were so interblended in the formation of the Warren Association that it will be necessary to look at both in connection with that important movement.

As far back as 1656 the magistrates of Connecticut asked those of Massachusetts some questions concerning infant baptism. June 4th, 1657, a meeting of ministers was held in Boston, who adopted what is known as the Half-way Covenant, which provided 'that all persons of sober life and correct sentiments, without being examined as to a change of heart, might profess religion or become members of the Church, and have their children baptized, though they did not come to the Lord's table.' A synod of all the ministers in Massachusetts ratified this provision in the same year. It will be readily seen that such an unscriptural step opened the doors of the Congregational Churches to an immense influx of unconverted people and to a corresponding worldliness of life. The Baptists were obliged, almost single-handed, to stem this public sentiment, but they bravely stood firm for Gospel principles. The Churches increased in number and influence continually, and in a large measure they counteracted these dangerous influences upon the public mind. The Baptist Church in Boston built a new church edifice in 1680, and in 1683 John Emblem from England became their pastor; after serving them for fifteen years, he died in 1699, when Ellis Callender succeeded him. He was followed by Elisha Callender and Jeremiah Condry, until Samuel Stillman took charge in 1765. By the time that the second

Callender became pastor, the spirituality of the Baptists had so commended them to the respect of the better portion of the community that the three principal clergymen in Boston, Increase Mather, Cotton Mather and John Webb, not only consented to be present at his ordination, but Mr. Mather most cheerfully preached the ordination sermon, May 21st, 1718. And what was as noble as it was remarkable, he had the manliness to select as his subject, 'Good Men United!' In the face of the whole colony he condemned 'the wretched notion of wholesale severities' These he called 'cruel wrath,' and said roundly: 'New England also has, in some former times, done something of this aspect, which would not now be so well approved of, in which, if the brethren in whose house we are now convened met with any thing too unbrotherly, they now with satisfaction hear us expressing our dislike of every thing that has looked like persecution in the days that have passed over us.' [Winsor's *Memorial Hist. of Boston*, iii, p. 422]

In 1729 the bitterness of the General Court of Massachusetts was so far relaxed against Baptists as to exempt them from paying the parish ministerial taxes if they alleged a scruple of conscience in the matter. [Winsor, ii, p. 227] This, however, by no means ended their sufferings, for in 1753 the Court required the minister and two principal members of a Baptist Church to sign a certificate that the person to be exempt was a member of that Church, and besides, the Church of which he was a member should obtain a certificate from three other Baptist Churches to prove that the Church to which he belonged really was a Baptist Church. Of course, our Churches resisted this provision and, in 1754, remonstrated with the Assembly at Boston. At once it was moved in this body, but not carried, that the signers of the remonstrance should be

taken into custody. In the paper which they had sent to the Assembly they had shown how the Baptists had been thrown into jail, their cattle and goods sold at auction for a quarter of their value because they refused to pay Church rates, and they held that all this was contrary to the royal charter, which granted them liberty of conscience. Manning wrote to Dr. Samuel Stennett, June 5th, 1771, of his brethren's hard treatment in Massachusetts by imprisonment and the despoiling of their property. He says of the authorities:

'They are afraid if they relax the secular arm their tenets have not merit enough and a sufficient foundation to stand. This has been so plainly hinted by some of the committees of the General Court, upon treating with our people, that I think it cannot be deemed a breach of charity to think this of them...Some of our Churches are sorely oppressed on account of religion. Their enemies continue to triumph over them, and as repeated applications have been made to the Court of Justice and to the General Courts for the redress of such grievances, but as yet have been neglected, it is now become necessary to carry the affair to England, in order to lay it before the king.'

Dr. Stennett was known personally to George III, who greatly respected him; hence he used his influence with the king, in company with Dr. Llewelyn and Mr. Wallin, to secure relief. On July 31st, 1771, his majesty 'disallowed and rejected' the act of Massachusetts in oppressing the Baptists at Ashfield; and Dr. John Ryland, in writing to Manning, says that Dr. Stennett procured that order. Three hundred and ninety-eight acres of land, belonging in part to Dr. Ebenezer Smith, a Baptist minister, and the Ashfield Baptists, had been seized and sold to build a Congregational meeting-house. On this land was a dwelling-house and orchard, and also a

The American Baptists

burying-ground, so that the Baptists found their dead taken from them as well as their property. The Warren Association met at Medfield, Sept. 7th, 1772, and refused to carry in any more certificates for exemption from ministerial taxes, because to do so implied a right on the part of the State to levy such a tax, and because it was destructive to religious liberty and the proper conduct of civil society. They demanded the right to stand on an equality before the law, not as a sect, but as citizens. Meanwhile the Baptist Churches fast multiplied everywhere. A second Baptist Church was formed in Boston itself in 1743, and others followed at various places and dates, as Middleborough, Newton, etc.; so that by 1776 there were about forty Baptist Churches in Massachusetts alone. Their cause in New England received a strong impetus from the preaching of Whitefield and his colaborers, which ushered in the great awakening. While Whitefield was not a Baptist, he insisted on a spiritual Church and that none but those who had experienced the new birth should become members therein, a position which logically carried men to the Baptists in a community where the Half-way Covenant was in force. He landed at Newport in September, 1740, and for three months preached daily. Tennant, Bellamy, Wheelock, Davenport, and many others followed him, and it is estimated that within two years between thirty and forty thousand persons professed conversion to Christ. Many Churches of the Standing Order arrayed themselves against him; others were indifferent to his movements. Harvard and Yale Colleges officially took ground against him. Dr. Chauncey, of Boston, wrote a volume against him; and the General Court of Connecticut enacted laws restricting ministers to their own pulpits, unless specially invited by the minister of another parish, and making it illegal for any unsettled minister to preach at all.

It was not strange that these converts,

finding such opposition or cold welcome in the Congregational Churches, should seek homes elsewhere. In many cases they formed Churches of their own and were known as Separatists, and Backus says that between September, 1746, and May, 1751, thirty-one persons were ordained as pastors of Separate Churches. These new converts were insensibly and inevitably led nearer to the Baptist position than to that taken by the great body of the Congregational State Churches. The Churches of the Standing Order were filled with unconverted persons, with many who had grown up in them from infancy, being introduced at that time by christening; and but a small proportion of their members made any claim to a spiritual regeneration. The intuitions of a converted soul recoil from Church associations with those whose only claim to membership in Christ's mystical body is a ceremony performed over an unconscious infant, for the renewed man seeks fellowship with those who, like himself, have exercised faith in Christ's saving merits, and he is likely to take the Scriptures for his guide in seeking his Church home. Whitefield himself taught his converts, when preaching on Rom.6:1-4, that their death to sin enjoined another order of duty. He says: 'It is certain that in the words of our text there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion, which our Church [Episcopal] allows, and insists upon it, that children should be immersed in water, unless those that bring the children to be baptized assure the minister that they cannot bear the plunging.' [*Sermons*, xiii, p. 197, Boston ed.] In these and similar words he showed his hearers that the New Testament disciples were a body of immersed believers, and when Jonathan Edwards repudiated the Half-way Covenant, numbers embraced his views; some few new Baptist Churches were formed in Massachusetts, but many

Whitefieldians and Baptists attempted to build together in what were popularly known as New Light or Separatist Churches. Of course such a compromise between Baptist and Pedobaptist principles could not long be practiced, and gradually the Baptists withdrew to form their own congregations. Backus says that for the twenty years between 1760 and 1780 two new Baptist Churches were organized each year.

The life and ministry of Isaac Backus himself illustrates the sweep of the Baptist movement in New England. He was converted to God during this great awakening, and with many misgivings united with the Congregational Church at Norwich, Conn., but afterward joined with fifteen others in forming a Separate Church, composed of Baptists and Pedobaptists. Two years afterward, 1748, having now reached the age of twenty-six years, he formed a Church of this mixed order at Middleborough, Mass. Soon the question of baptism began to agitate the body, and a number of his people rejected infant baptism and sprinkling as baptism. After a time Mr. Backus followed them on conviction, and in 1756 he formed the First Baptist Church at Middleborough. The story of his change of faith and denominational relations is a type of the inward and outward changes through which many earnest men passed at that time, and united with the Baptists or formed new Churches of that order and Backus acted as a leader in this direction.

We have seen that James Manning was first a student at Hopewell; after spending four years at the College of New Jersey, at Princeton, from which he was graduated in 1762 with the second highest honors of his class, he was intrusted by the Philadelphia Association with the arduous task of establishing a denominational college 'on some suitable part of this continent.' After consulting largely with

friends, amongst them Gardner, the Deputy-Governor of Rhode Island, he established a Latin School at Warren, and organized a Baptist Church there in 1764. This school was subsequently removed to Providence, where it is still continued as the University Grammar School. In 1765 he was appointed President of the College of Rhode Island, and Professor of Languages and other branches of learning, with full power to act in these capacities at Warren and elsewhere. He began his work with one student, William Rogers, from Newport; three others were added within a year, and at the first commencement, in 1769, he graduated seven. A college charter was obtained from the General Assembly of Rhode Island, and \$2,000 were subscribed for building and endowing the college. He saw at once that his success depended on the interest which the Churches took in the institution, and seeing that this could only be accomplished by united effort, he and Hezekiah Smith determined on forming an Association, with the double purpose of resisting the oppressions of the Standing Order in New England and of securing an educated Baptist ministry. This was accomplished, at Warren in 1767. For six years the college remained at Warren, when a contest, arose between Warren, East Greenwich, Newport and Providence for the honor of the permanent location, and in 1770 the college was removed to Providence. Manning then resigned his pastorate at Warren, accepted that of the Providence Church in 1771, and for twenty years held the twofold relation of pastor and president. The Warren Association was intimately identified with the development at the college for many years, thus making them mutual blessings. Backus tells us that a number of elders being together in consultation about the affairs of the young institution, they sent invitations to other brethren, and the result was

The American Baptists

the meeting at Warren of representatives from eleven Churches, with three ministers from the Philadelphia Association for consultation concerning the organization of the new Association. John Gano was pastor of the Baptist Church in New York at teatime and brother-in-law of President Manning. Gano presided over their delegations, and Isaac Backus acted as clerk. After full deliberation, some of the Churches, fearing that an Association might assume jurisdiction over them, faltered, and that body was formed by the representatives, of four Churches only, namely, Warren, Bellingham, Haverhill and Second Middleborough, but the latter Church withdrew at the second meeting, 1768.

President Manning then drew up a statement closely defining the objects of the Warren Association, adapted to remove misapprehensions, and in 1770 the Middleborough Church with Backus as pastor, returned, 'upon the express condition that no complaint should ever be received by the Association against any particular Church that was not of the Association, nor from any censured member of any of our Churches.' This body of Churches defined that its union was 'consistent with independency and power of particular Churches, because it pretended to being other than an advisory council, utterly, disclaiming superiority, jurisdiction, coercive right and infallibility.' On these principles the Association won its way, and in 1777 it embraced in its membership 31 churches and 1,617 communicants. The service which it rendered to Baptist interests in those days of weakness and trial was very great, for it was a missionary society as well as a fraternal body. It organized an Educational Fund for ministerial education; it appointed a committee to present serious Baptist grievances to the government of Massachusetts and Connecticut; it sent an agent to England to lay their case before the king; and

it appealed for subscriptions to all the Baptist Churches of this continent, admonishing them to rally to the support of their own college as a Christian duty. Also it appointed Benjamin Foster and others to prepare a spelling-book, a good English grammar and a Baptist catechism. Foster was a graduate of Yale, was appointed to defend the Pedobaptist position in the exercises of that college, and became a Baptist on conviction as the result. The hallowed influences exerted by the Philadelphia and Warren Associations in molding the Baptist denomination in the New World can never be told.

Justice, however, demands as high a tribute to Morgan Edwards as to James Manning, for his zeal and ability in establishing the college. Indeed, Dr. Guild, the present librarian of Brown University, frankly pays him this tribute. He says of Morgan:

'He was the prime mover in the enterprise of establishing the college, and in 1767 he went back to England and secured the first funds for its endowment. With him were associated the Rev. Samuel Jones, to whom in 1791 was offered the presidency; Oliver Hart and Francis Pelot, of South Carolina; John Hart, of Hopewell, the signer of the Declaration of Independence; John Stites, the mayor of Elizabethtown; Hezekiah Smith, Samuel Stillman, John Gano and others connected with the two Associations named, of kindred zeal and spirit. The final success of the movement, however, may justly be ascribed to the life-long labors of him who was appointed the first president, James Manning, D.D., of New Jersey.' [*New England Magazine*, January 1886, p. 4]

It is right to say here that he, being a Welshman, it was meet that he should be the 'prime mover' in establishing the first Baptist college in America on the very soil where Roger Williams, his countryman, had planted the first free republic of this land. There is also

very much poetic lore in the thought that he should leave his Church in Philadelphia to enlist the men of Wales in the interests of the young institution. He brought back a large sum of money for this object, and had so stirred the sympathies of Dr. Richards, of South Wales, that he bequeathed his library of 1,300 volumes to its use. And now, probably, there is not such a collection of Welsh books in America as is found in the town of the brave Welshman who founded Providence. Welsh affection for Brown merits that 'poetic justice' which led its present librarian to bless the memory of the other immortal Welshman, Morgan Edwards, as the prime mover in its establishment. Mr. Edwards was thoroughly educated and became pastor of the Philadelphia Church, on the recommendation of Dr. Gill, in 1761, and remained there till 1771, when he removed to Delaware, where he died in 1795. His influence was very great, but would have been much enlarged had he identified himself with the cause of the colonies in their struggle with the mother country. His family was identified with the service of his majesty of England, and Morgan was so full of Welsh fire that he could not hold his tongue, which much afflicted his brethren and involved him in trouble with the American authorities, as we find in the following recantation: At a meeting of the Committee of White Clay Creek, at Mr. Henry Darby's, in New York, August 7th, 1775, William Patterson, Esq., being in the chair, when the Rev. Morgan Edwards attended and signed the following recantation, which was voted satisfactory, namely:

'Whereas, I have some time since frequently made use of rash and imprudent expressions with respect to the conduct of my fellow-countrymen, who are now engaged in a noble and patriotic struggle for the liberties of America, against the arbitrary measures of

the British ministry; which conduct has justly raised their resentment against me, I now confess that I have spoken wrong, for which I am sorry and ask forgiveness of the public. And I do promise that for the future I will conduct myself in such a manner as to avoid giving offense, and at the same time, in Justice to myself, declare that I am a friend to the present measures pursued by the friends to American liberty, and do hereby approve of them, and, as far as in my power, will endeavor to promote them. Morgan Edwards'

How sound his conversion was to Revolutionary 'measures' is not a proper question to raise here, but as the offense was one of the tongue, he made the amend as broad as the sin, and there is no known evidence that he ever gave too free rein to the unruly member thereafter on the subject of the 'noble and patriotic struggles for the liberties of America.' It is sure, however, that when American liberties were secured he brought forth abundant fruits, 'meet for repentance,' in the labors which he devoted to the cause of American education. He also traveled many thousands of miles on horseback to collect materials for the history of the Baptist Churches in the colonies which he had done so much to build up. His purpose was to publish a history in about twelve volumes. He issued the first volume in 1770, which treated of the Pennsylvania Baptists; the second volume related to the New Jersey Baptists and was published in 1792; his treatment of the Rhode Island Baptists was not sent forth by him, but appeared in the sixth volume of the *Rhode Island Historical Collections* of 1867. He left the third volume in manuscript, concerning the Delaware Baptists, which is now in possession of the Baptist Historical Society, Philadelphia. He was as noble, refined and scholarly a servant of Christ as could be found in the colonies. He died in Delaware in 1795; his

The American Baptists

body, which was first buried in the Baptist meeting-house, La Grange Place, between Market and Arch Streets, Philadelphia, now

rests in Mount Moriah Cemetery, and every true American Baptist blesses his memory.

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

No chapter of Baptist history, European or American, fills honest hearts with warmer gratitude and thanksgiving than that of Virginia. The first settlers of this colony were cavaliers, from the upper classes of English society, profoundly loyal to the English government and zealous of religious observances. The Virginian charter of April 10th, 1606, made the Church of England the religion of the colony, and devotion to the king, its head and defender, the test of loyalty; hence all were taxed for its support. Before Plymouth Rock was known, and nearly a quarter of a century before Massachusetts Bay Colony was organized, the soil of Virginia was hallowed by praise to God in public worship. Captain John Smith tells us this beautiful story of his religious acts at Jamestown:

'When I first went to Virginia, I well remember we did hang an awning, which is an old sail, to three or four trees to shadow us from the sun. Our walls were rails of wood, our seats unhewed trees, till we cut planks, our pulpit a bar of wood nailed to two neighboring trees. In foul weather we shifted into an old rotten tent. This was our church, till we built a homely thing like a barn, set up crotchets, covered with rafts, sedge and earth, so was also the walls, the best of our houses of the like curiosity, but the most part far much worse workmanship, that could neither well defend wind or rain. Yet we had daily common prayer, morning and evening; every Sunday two sermons, and every three months the Holy Communion, till our minister, Mr. Hunt, died. But our prayers daily, with a homily on Sunday, we continued two or three years after, till more preachers came. And surely God did most mercifully hear us, till the continual inundations of mistaken directions, factions and numbers of unprovided libertines, near consumed us all, as the Israelites in the wilderness.'

Happy had it been for the colonists if this freedom and simplicity of voluntary worship

had been continued amongst them, as this noble character commenced it in his rude Jamestown temple, without doubt the first ever erected in North America. The charter made withdrawal from the Episcopal Church a crime equal to revolt from the government. It further required that if any one were drawn away from the 'doctrines, rites and religion, now professed and established within our realm of England,' the person so offending should be 'arrested and imprisoned, until he shall fully and thoroughly reform him, or otherwise when the cause so requireth, that he shall with all convenient speed be sent into our realm of England, here to receive condign punishment, for his or their said offense.'

Each successive Governor promulgated his own code of laws, directing his subordinate in the details of administration. That of Sir Thomas Dale, in 1611, provided that every man or woman, 'now present or hereafter to arrive' should give an account of his or their faith and religion, and repair unto the minister, that their orthodoxy might be tested. Upon refusal to do this the minister should give notice to the Governor or chief officers of the town, and for the first refusal the offender was to be whipped, for the second to be whipped twice and to acknowledge his fault on the Sabbath day in the congregation, and for the third offense he was to be whipped every day until the acknowledgment was made and forgiveness craved. The very severity of this code prevented its full execution, and succeeding Governors relaxed these provisions in their several codes. But though corporal punishment was gradually abandoned, the spirit of intolerance as to any departure from the Church of England remained the same, being quite as severe as that of Massachusetts Bay against all dissent from Congregationalism. Henning says that the General Assembly appears to have devoted

itself to enforcing attendance on the services of the Church of England in the colony. In 1623 it provided that public worship should be held in every plantation according to its canons, that its ministers should be paid by a tax upon the people, and that no other ministers but those of that Church 'shall be permitted to preach or teach, publicly or privately,' and that the Governor and Council shall take care that all Non-conformists depart the colony with all conveniency.

The first nine Acts of 1661 provided for the support of the State Church; in each parish a church edifice was to be built out of the public treasury, together with a parsonage house and the purchase of a globe for the minister's use. He was to receive a salary of £80 sterling, a provision subsequently changed to 16,000 pounds of tobacco, to be levied on the parish and collected like other taxes. Each minister must be ordained by a Bishop in England, all other preachers were to be banished; every person who wilfully avoided attendance on the parish Church for one Sunday was to be fined fifty pounds of tobacco; every Non-conformist was to be fined £20 for a month's absence, and if he failed to attend for a year he must be apprehended and give security for his good behavior, or remain in prison till he was willing to attend Church. Much pretense has been made, that because the early settlers of the colony were cavaliers, they were less austere, more polished and of gentler blood than the Puritans of Massachusetts. But the brutal intolerance of the English Court was faithfully copied by them, and no darker or more bloody pages stain English or Massachusetts history than those that defile the early records of Virginia. White tells us of a band of men who were driven from Virginia 'for their religious opinions' in 1634. [*Annals of Annapolis*, p. 23] Bulk records the revolting barbarities inflicted on Stevenson Reek for the same cause in 1640.

He 'stood in the pillory two hours with a label on his back, paid a fine of £50, and was imprisoned at the pleasure of the Governor,' for simply saying, in a jocular manner, that his majesty was at confession with my lord of Canterbury.' [*Ecc. Hist. of Va.*, ii, pp. 51-67] Holmes details, at length, that in 1648 four missionaries were sent from Massachusetts to Virginia, Messrs. James, Knollys, Thompson and Harrison. They held a few meetings there in private, but their little congregations were violently broken up and the missionaries banished, while many of their hearers were imprisoned. [Annals, 289] James Ryland, a member of the House of Burgesses from the Isle of Wight County, prepared a Catechism which was pronounced 'blasphemous' for which he was expelled in 1652; and for some other trivial religious offense a member from Norfolk was expelled in 1663. Virginia had adhered to the king against Cromwell and the Commonwealth, and Dr. Hawks, the eloquent Episcopal historian of Virginia, tells of four of Cromwell's soldiers who were 'rudely hung, as a warning to the remainder' in 1680, for their religious opinions, under the pretense that 'their assemblages' were 'perverted from religious to treasonable purposes', 'these religious assemblages themselves being regarded as a subversion of the government.' [*Hist. of Episcopacy in Va.*, pp. 71-72]

Hening states that the 111th Act of the Grand Assembly of 1661-62 declared that, 'Whereas, Many schismatical persons, out of their averseness to the orthodox established religion, or out of the new-fangled conceits of their own heretical inventions, refuse to have their children baptized; Be it therefore enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that all persons that in contempt of the divine sacrament of baptism, shall refuse when they may carry their child to a lawful minister in that county, to have them baptized, shall be amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco; half

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

to the informer, half to the public.' [Statutes at large, ii, pp. 165-166]

This was a blow dealt at the Quakers, as there seem to have been no Baptists in the colony at that time. Several Acts of the Assembly in 1659, 1662 and 1693 made it a crime for parents to refuse the baptism of their children. Jefferson writes: 'If no execution took place here, as in New England, it was not owing to the moderation of the Church or the spirit of the Legislature, as may be inferred from the law itself, but to historical circumstances which have not been handed down to us.'

When William and Mary came to the throne, in 1689, their accession was signalized by that enactment of Parliament called the Act of Toleration. Even this, as Dr. Woolsey remarks, 'removed only the harshest restrictions upon Protestant religious worship, and was arbitrary, unequal and unsystematic in its provisions.' Still, it was the entering wedge to religious freedom, and while the Baptists of England gladly availed themselves of it and organized under it in London as a great Association for new work, a hundred and seventeen Churches being represented, the authorities of Virginia thought it inoperative in their colony. It was not until a score of years after the passage of this Act that the colonial Legislature gave to the colonists the meager liberties which it granted to the British subject. When, however, news of this Act reached Virginia, the few individual Baptists then scattered abroad there resolved on their full liberty as British subjects under its provisions. They entreated the London Meeting to send them ministers, an entreaty which was followed by a correspondence running through many years. In 1714 Robert Nordin and Thomas White were sent as ordained ministers to the colony, but White died upon the voyage. Up to this time there seems to have been no organized body of Baptists in Virginia, although there are

traces of individuals in North Carolina as early as 1696, who had fled from Virginia to escape her intolerance. Semple finds the first Baptist Church of Virginia organized in association with the labors of Nordin at Burleigh, Isle of Wight County, in 1714, on the south side of the river and opposite Jamestown. Howell thinks that before the coming of Nordin there had been a gathering of citizens there, joined by others from Surry County for consultation, and that they had petitioned the London Baptists to send them help. Be this as it may, Nordin was soon followed by two other ministers, Messrs. Jones and Mintz, and under the labors of these men of God the first Church was formed in that year, and soon after one at Brandon, in the County of Surry. The first is now known as Mill Swamp; it is thought that the Otterdams Church is the second. These were General Baptists, but in a few years they embraced Calvinistic sentiments, and Nordin labored in that region till he died, in 1725.

While this movement was in progress in the southern part of Virginia, the influence of the Welsh Baptists, in Pennsylvania and Delaware, began to be felt in Berkeley, London and Rockingham Counties, which were visited by their ministers. Semple thinks that these laborers first readied the colony through Edward Hays and Thomas Yates, members of the Saters Baptist Church, in Maryland, and that Revs. Loveall, Heaton and Gerard soon followed them. Churches were then gathered at Opecon, Mill Creek, Ketocton and other points in rapid succession, which became members of the Philadelphia Association, from which they received the counsel and aid of David Thomas, John Gano and James Miller, which accounts in part for the rapid spread of Baptist principles in North Virginia. They were soon strengthened, also, by the labors of two men of great power, formerly of other denominations, who became Baptists. Shubael Stearns, a native of Boston,

The American Baptists

Mass., was converted under the preaching of George Whitefield, and united himself with the revival party of the Congregationalists, called New Lights, in 1745. He continued with them for six years, when he became convinced, from an examination of the Scriptures, that infant baptism was a human institution and that it was his duty to confess Christ on his faith. Accordingly, he was immersed by Elder Palmer at Tolland, Conn., May 20th, 1751, and was ordained a Baptist minister. After continuing in New England for about three years, he longed to carry the Gospel to the regions beyond, and made for Berkeley and Hampshire Counties, Va. There God made him wonderfully successful, and his fame spread through all the region. He itinerated largely in North Carolina as well as in Virginia, and gathered an immense harvest for Christ. Morgan Edwards describes him as a marvelous preacher for moving the emotions and melting his audiences to tears. The most exciting stories are told about the piercing glance of his eye and the melting tones of his voice, while his appearance was that of a patriarch. Tidence Lane, who afterward became a distinguished Baptist minister, says that he had the most hateful feelings toward the Baptists, but curiosity led him to hear Mr. Stearns:

'Upon my arrival, I saw a venerable old man sitting under a peach-tree, with a book in his hand and the people gathering about him. He fixed his eyes upon me immediately, which made me feel in such a manner as I never had felt before. I turned to quit the place, but could not proceed far. I walked about, sometimes catching his eyes as I walked. My uneasiness increased and became intolerable. I went up to him, thinking that a salutation and shaking of hands would relieve me; but it happened otherwise. I began to think that he had an evil eye and ought to be shunned; but shunning him I could no more effect than a bird can shun the rattlesnake

when it fixes its eyes upon it. When he began to preach my perturbations increased, so that nature could no longer support them and I sank to the ground.'

Rev. Daniel Marshall was brother-in-law to Stearns, and had formerly been a Presbyterian minister at Windsor, Conn., but had served for some years as a missionary to the Indians on the upper Susquehanna. War between the colony of Maryland and the Indians had arrested his work, and on examining the Scriptures, he, too, became a Baptist, being immersed near Winchester, Va., in the forty-eighth year of his age. He and Stearns preached in Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Churches were multiplied in every direction. Dr. Howell, in treating of this period, says that

'The fields were white to harvest. God poured out his Holy Spirit. One universal impulse pervaded, apparently, the minds of the whole people. Evidently hungering for the bread of life, they came together in vast multitudes. Everywhere the ministry of these men was attended with the most extraordinary success. Very large numbers were baptized. Churches sprang up by scores. Among the converts were many able men, who at once entered the ministry, and swelled continually the ranks of the messengers of salvation.'

So quickly did the work of God spread amongst the people in every direction, that the influence of our Churches began to be felt in shaping the political destinies of the colony; and that influence has continued to our times. Prominent amongst the causes of this rapid growth was the character of the preaching. The preachers were from the people to whom they spoke, so that they understood their necessities and difficulties. Reports of many of these early sermons are extant. They are characterized by great simplicity of thought and structure, are peculiarly adapted to arouse the conscience to the need of Christ, to present his finished work in all its gracious bearings, and to lead to

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

immediate decision in his service. Colonial life had fostered independent thought and a willingness to meet peril in shaking off the State Church, whose ministers no longer commanded the respect of the people. Formalism had engendered license in the pulpit as well as in the pew, so that many of the clergy were not only cruel, but immoral, also. The very means which in earlier years had been taken to hinder the spread of Baptist doctrines now contributed to their dissemination, and the people hungered for the bread of life.

Persecution, as usual, over-reached itself, and the reaction was very great. John Leland says, the Baptist 'ministers were imprisoned and the disciples buffeted.' James Madison, in writing to a Philadelphia friend, in 1774, said:

'That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution rages among some, and to their eternal infamy the clergy can furnish their quota of imps for such purposes. There are at the present time, in the adjacent county, not less than five or six well-meaning men in close jail for proclaiming their religious sentiments, which are the main quite orthodox.'

Yet this hard flint of persecution struck the true fire of soul liberty. Dr. Hawks is compelled to admit of the State clergy that they were in many cases a disgrace to their profession; and Hammond denounces them thus: 'Many came, such as wore black coats and could babble in a pulpit, roar in a tavern, exact from their parishioners and, rather, by their dissoluteness, destroy than feed their flocks.' These so embittered the spirits of the baser class against the pure and godly men who went everywhere preaching the word that, even after the Toleration Act had compelled the colony to modify her laws, and they could not legally be imprisoned for preaching the Gospel, mob law was let loose upon them everywhere, and they were thrust into prison for the sin of others in

disturbing the public peace. Everywhere their congregations were disturbed and broken up. Howe says: 'A snake and a hornet's nest were thrown into their meeting, and even in one case fire-arms were brought to disperse them.' [*Hist. Collections of Va.*, p. 379] Taylor says that the Baptist ministers were

'Fined, pelted, beaten, imprisoned, poisoned and hunted with dogs; their congregations were assaulted and dispersed; the solemn ordinance of baptism was rudely interrupted, both administrators and candidates being plunged and held beneath the water till nearly dead; they suffered mock trials, and even in courts of justice were subjected to indignities not unlike those inflicted by the infamous Jeffreys.'

Dr. Semple, actuated by the same sweet spirit and sincere honesty which moved Taylor, gives this description of the Baptist ministers: They 'were without learning, without patronage, generally very poor, very plain in their dress, unrefined in their manners and awkward in their address; all of which, by their enterprising zeal and unceasing perseverance, they either turned to advantage or prevented their ill effects.'

Yet they had the stoutest hearts, the most masculine intellects, and some of them were eloquent to a proverb; a perfect phalanx of Christian Spartans. About thirty of them were put in prison, some of them several times, but by preaching Jesus through the gates and on the high walls many were brought to Christ. Rev. Eleazar Clay, the guardian of the great statesman, Henry Clay, wrote from Chesterfield County to John Williams: 'The preaching at the prison is not attended in vain, for we hope that several are converted, while others are under great distress and made to cry out, What shall we do to be saved?' and he begged him to come down and baptize the converts. Crowds gathered around the prisons at Fredericksburg,

The American Baptists

in the counties of King and Queen, Culpepper, Middlesex and Essex, Orange and Caroline. They were preached to by Harris, Ireland, Pickett, the Craigs, of whom there were three brothers, Greenwood, Barrow, Weathersford, Ware, Tinsley, Waller, Webber and others whose names will be honored while Virginia exists. And there are some noted cases of holy triumph, as in the prison at Culpepper, whence Ireland, much after the order of Bunyan, who was 'had home to prison in the county jail of Bedford,' dated his letters, from 'my palace in Culpepper.' On the very spot where the prison stood, where powder was cast under the floor to blow him up, and brimstone was burnt to suffocate him and poison was administered to kill him; on that spot where he preached through the iron grates to the people, there the Baptist meeting-house now stands; and the Church which occupies it numbers more than 200 members. These diabolical schemes were all frustrated and, after much suffering, he barely escaped with his life; yet he says: 'My prison was a place in which I enjoyed much of the divine presence; a day seldom passed without some token of the divine goodness toward me.' Waller, a most powerful man, who before his conversion was the terror of the good, being known as the 'Devil's Adjutant and Swearing Jack,' spent 113 days in four different prisons, besides enduring all forms of abuse; but in Virginia alone he immersed 2,000 believers and helped to constitute eighteen Churches. Want of space demands silence concerning a list of most illustrious ministers and laymen, whose names will never be honored as they deserve, until some equally illustrious son of Virginia shall arrange and shape her abundant mass of Baptist material with the integrity of a Bancroft and the eloquence of a Macaulay. For three months in succession three men of God lay in the jail at Fredericksburg for the crime of preaching the

glorious Gospel of the blissful God – Elders Lewis Craig, John Waller and James Childs. But their brethren stood nobly by these grand confessors. Truly, in the words of Dr. Hawks,

'No dissenters in Virginia, experienced for a time harsher treatment than did the Baptists. They were beaten and imprisoned; and cruelty taxed its ingenuity to devise new modes of punishment and annoyance. The usual consequences followed. Persecution made friends for its victims; and the men who were not permitted to speak in public found willing auditors in the sympathizing crowds who gathered around the prisons to hear them preach from the grated windows. It is not improbable that this very opposition imparted strength in another mode, inasmuch as it at last furnished the Baptists with a common ground on which to make resistance.' [*Hist. Prot. Ep. Ch. in Va.*, p. 121]

We shall see much more of their struggles for liberty to preach the Gospel when we come to consider the period of the Revolutionary War, and for the present must look at their internal affairs and growth. Although they multiplied rapidly in the latter half of the eighteenth century, they were much divided by controversies amongst themselves; first, on the question of Calvinism, and then, strangely enough, on Episcopacy. The Calvinistic controversy had been imported by the General and Particular Baptists, who had come from England.

For a time they lived happily with each other, probably held together by the cohesive power of opposition from without. But by and by, as they became stronger, they dropped the names of General and Particular and conducted their doctrinal contest under the name of Separate and Regular Baptists. Samuel Harris, John Waller and Jeremiah Walker were leaders on the Arminian side, while E. Craig, William Murphy and John Williams were leaders on the Calvinistic side; but while they conducted their

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

debates with great freedom of utterance, they also clung to each other with brotherly love. Having suffered so much together in a common cause, the thought of separation was too painful to be endured. They, therefore, treated each other with all the cordiality of Christian gentlemen, or, as Mr. Spurgeon would say, they agreed to keep two bears in their house, 'bear and forbear;' and the result was, after a long and full discussion in 1787, they agreed to know each other, and to be known to others, as The United Baptist Churches of Christ in Virginia.

The manner in which our Virginia fathers were exercised on the question of Episcopacy would be a topic of amusement to the Baptists there in our times, if reverence for their sires did not honor all their sincere convictions. The early General Baptists of England raised the question whether Ephesians 4:11-13, did not continue the Apostolic office in the Church after the death of the Apostles; and thinking that it did, they selected an officer whose prerogatives were above those of an Elder, and for fully a century this officer visited their Churches as a Messenger or Superintendent, as they thought Timothy and Titus might have been. He was commonly elected and set apart to his work by an Association, and his chief duty was to itinerate, preach the Gospel, plant Churches and regulate their affairs. In the Confession of the General Baptists of 1678 his duties are thus laid down: 'The Bishops have the government of those Churches that had suffrage in their election, and no others ordinarily; as also to preach the word in the world.' Hook says that their work was 'to plant Churches, ordain officers, set in order things that were wanting in all the Churches, to defend the Gospel against gainsayers, and to travel up and down the world for this purpose.' The Virginia Baptist fathers, wanting to observe every thing that they thought was done in the Apostolic Churches, decided by a majority

vote, at the General Association of 1775, that his office was to be continued, and appointed Samuel Harris for the district lying south of the James River; shortly after which, Elijah Craig and John Waller were appointed for that on the north side. At the previous meeting of, this body, after two days' debate, they had deferred the further consideration of the subject for a year. That year was spent in warm discussion of the matter. Walker advocated the doctrine in a pamphlet, Ford opposed it in another, and the Association then unanimously elected Harris an *Apostle* by ballot. They observed a day of fasting before the ordination, at which Elijah Craig, Waller and Williams offered prayer, then each ordained minister present laid hands upon the head of Harris and gave him the hand of fellowship. At the autumn meeting Waller and Craig were ordained, and these three Baptist Bishops were let loose upon the Churches under this rule:

'If our Messenger, or Apostle, shall transgress in any manner, he shall be liable to dealing in any Church where the transgression is committed; and the said Church is instructed to call helps from two or three neighboring Churches; and if by them found a transgressor, a General Conference of the Churches shall be called to excommunicate or to restore him.' [Semple's *Hist. Va. Baptists*, pp. 58-59]

As might have been expected amongst Baptists, the advocates of the measure were not chosen; the Churches put on their glasses and brought out their New Testaments to see where they could find this crotchet, and not finding it, at the next year's meeting of the Association the 'Apostles' were very chop-fallen, and reporting their cold reception and discouragements, quit their high episcopacy at once. The Association was so much mortified at this play at priests that it had not the patience to pass an act abolishing the apostolate, but let it die a natural

death; afterward, however, the body took a solemn farewell of its defunct bishopric by recording on its minutes the following declaration, as a sort of epitaph: 'That the office of apostles, like that of prophets, was the effect of miraculous inspiration; and does not belong to ordinary times.' Nor since that day have Virginia Baptists seen any times extraordinary calling for the resurrection of their 'apostles.'

The primitive Baptists of Virginia were often treated with contempt because many of their ministers were not classical scholars, and yet some of them were the peers of the first men in the pulpits of the colony, no matter of what denomination; not only in all that enstamps with a high and practical manhood, but also in the higher branches of education. They were men of profound knowledge in all that relates to Gospel truth, to the true science of human government, and to that patriotism which has made the Virginia commonwealth so great a power in our land. They wrought a work which even the heroes of Rhode Island did not equal in some respects. Just as it is harder to purify a corrupted system than to originate one that is right and true, so far they excelled our brethren there. Their contest was steady, long and fiery, yet they never wavered, took no rash steps nor violent measures, but, with true loyalty to their holy convictions, pressed on against all odds, until their resistless wisdom and energy, directed by an enduring perseverance that never flagged, gave them their deserved victory. Touching the question of education, it is little less than cruel to accuse them of ignorance, in view of the fact that they were not allowed to found schools, or build places of worship, nor to be at peace in their own homes. But as soon as they had conquered the right to breathe as faithful citizens and to organize Churches, despite their grinding oppressions, they at once betook themselves to the founding of schools and colleges, which

have since become an honor to the State and nation. As it was, however, with their slight classical and theological attainments, they did not fail to reach some of the first minds in Virginia. So pure were they, so biblical and so true to high conviction, that many of her first citizens openly identified themselves both with their cause and Churches. Some who stood high as statesmen and as educators felt and confessed their powerful influence.

Amongst these we find Dr. Archibald Alexander, born in 1772, and President of Hampden-Sidney College in 1796, one of the first scholars and divines in our country. In the frankest manner he unbosomed his heart thus:

'I fell into doubts respecting the authority of infant baptism. The origin of these doubts were in too rigid notions as to the purity of the Church, with a belief that receiving infants had a corrupting tendency. I communicated my doubts very freely to my friend, Mr. Lyle, and Mr. Speece, and found that they had both been troubled by the same. We talked much privately on the subject, and often conversed with others in hope of getting some new light. At length Mr. Lyle and I determined to give up the practice of baptizing infants until we should receive more light. This determination we publicly communicated to our people and left them to take such measures as they deemed expedient; but they seemed willing to admit the issue. We also communicated to the Presbytery the state of our minds, and left them to do what seemed good in the case; but as they believed that we were sincerely desirous of aiming at the truth, they took no steps and I believe made no record. Things remained in this position for more than a year. During this time I read much on both sides, and carried on a lengthened correspondence, particularly with Dr. Hoge. Two considerations kept me back from joining the Baptists. The first was, that the universal prevalence of infant baptism, as early as the fourth and fifth centuries, was unaccountable on the supposition that no such practice existed in the times of the apostles. The other

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

was, that if the Baptists are right they are the only Christian Church on earth, and all other denominations are out of the visible Church.'

The soundness of the conclusions reached by this great head of the Alexander family, in the Presbyterian Church, will be differently estimated by different minds; but, at the least, he shows the spreading influence of the Virginia Baptists at the close of the last century. His objections to the Baptists were essentially those of the Roman Catholic to our principles and practices; and, ill-founded as they were, they prevented him from following his convictions on the main point at issue.

In another chapter it will be needful to treat of the Virginia Baptists, touching their active participation in the Revolutionary War, together with their prominence in settling the State policy of the Old Dominion, and the character of the Constitution of the, United States. This chapter, therefore, must close with a reference to their alleged molding power upon Thomas Jefferson, in his political career, as one of the founders of our government. Many historical writers have told us that he was in the habit of attending the business and other meetings of a Baptist Church near his residence; that he closely scrutinized its internal democratic policy and its democratic relations to its sister Churches; that he borrowed his conceptions of a free government, State and Federal, from the simplicity of Baptist Church independency and fraternity; and that, frequently, in conversation with his friends, ministers and neighbors, he confessed his indebtedness to their radical principles for his fixed convictions on the true methods of civil and religious liberty. If this popular tradition were entirely unsupported by contemporary testimony, his earnest and public co-operation with the Baptists in Virginia politics, and the close identity between our form of government, which he did so much to frame, and that of the Baptist Churches, must

ever contribute to keep it alive; the strength of the coincidence being sufficient in itself to create such a tradition even if it did not already exist. Curtis says:

'There was a small Baptist Church which held its monthly meetings for business at a short distance from Mr. Jefferson's house, eight or ten years before the American Revolution. Mr. Jefferson attended these meetings for several months in succession. The pastor on one occasion asked him how he was pleased with their Church government. Mr. Jefferson replied, that it struck him with great force and had interested him much, that he considered it the only form of true democracy then existing in the world, and had concluded that it would be the best plan of government for the American colonies. This was several years before the Declaration of Independence.' [*Progress of Baptist Principles*, p. 356]

This author also says that he had this statement at second-hand only, from Mrs. Madison, wife of the fourth President of the United States, who herself had freely conversed with Jefferson on the subject, and that her remembrance of these conversations was 'distinct,' he 'always declaring that it was a Baptist Church from which these views were gathered.' Madison and Jefferson stood side by side with the Baptists in their contest for a free government, and they served together in the Committee of Seventeen in the Assembly of Virginia, when it was secured in 1777. 'After desperate contests in that Committee almost daily, from the 11th of October to the 5th of December,' the measure was carried; but Jefferson says of his struggle, in his autobiography, that it was 'the severest in which he was ever engaged.' No person then living had better opportunities for knowing the facts on this matter than had Mrs. Madison. Then the records of the early Baptists in Virginia show that there were Baptist Churches in Albemarle

County, where Jefferson lived, which fact presents strong circumstantial evidence to the accuracy of this report. Semple mentions two such bodies, the Albemarle, founded in 1767, and the Toteer, 1775. John Asplund, in his Register for 1790, gives four Churches in that county, namely, 'Garrison's meeting, Pretey's Creek, Toteer Creek and White Sides Creek;' Garrison's having been organized in 1774; the others are given without date. He also says that these Churches had 258 members and 5 ministers, namely: William Woods, Jacob Watts, Bartlett Bonnet, Martin Dawson and Benjamin Burger. This renders it certain that besides Jefferson's intimacy with John Leland and other well-known names of our fathers, he had opportunities enough at home to become acquainted with Baptist principles and practices. Though he was skeptical on the subject of religion, he always spoke warmly of his co-operation with the Baptists in securing religious liberty. In a letter written to his neighbors, the members of the Buck Mountain Baptist Church, 1809, he says: 'We have acted together from the origin to the end of a memorable revolution, and we have contributed, each in the line allotted us, our endeavors to render its issues a permanent blessing to our country.'

It would be a pleasant task to trace the lives of some of the distinguished servants of God who filled Virginia with Baptist Churches; but their work erects for them an imperishable monument to which it is only needful to refer. We find that while the first Church was planted in the colony in 1714, in 1793 there were in the State 227 churches, 272 ministers, 22,793 communicants, and 14 Associations. Abiel Holmes says, in his *American Annals* (ii, 488 p.), that in 1793 the Baptists of the United States numbered 73,471, so that at that time Virginia contained nearly one third of the whole. In order to combine their efforts, a

General Association was formed in 1771, which was dissolved in 1783 and, in 1784, a General Committee was organized to take its place, consisting of two delegates from each Association; this again was superseded in 1800 by the General Meeting of Correspondence, which was composed of delegates from all the Associations and acted as a State Board of Baptist co-operation on all subjects of general interest. The statistics of our own times, however, far eclipse the ratio of growth in the most prosperous days of the last century. At the present time, 1886, the Virginia Baptists have 42 Associations, 868 ordained ministers, 1,608 churches, into whose fellowship there were baptized last, year 12,182 persons, making a total membership in the State of 238,266; being the largest number of Baptists in any State excepting Georgia. This prosperity is the more remarkable when we take into account that within the present century the largest defection from the regular Baptist ranks that has been known in this country took place in Virginia, under the late Rev. Alexander Campbell. Without a brief sketch of that movement the history of the Baptists there would be very imperfect, hence it is here submitted.

Alexander Campbell, a seceding minister from the North of Ireland, came to America in 1807, and became pastor of a Presbyterian Church in West Pennsylvania. Soon his father, Thomas Campbell, came to differ materially in some things with that Church, and set up worship in his own house, avowing this principle: 'When the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent.' A number adopted this doctrine and gathered at the meetings. Andrew Munro, a clearheaded seceder, said at once: 'If we adopt that as a basis, there is an end of infant baptism.' Soon both Thomas and Alexander, his son, with five others of the family rejected infant baptism, and on June 12th, 1812, were immersed on

profession of their faith in Christ, in Buffalo Creek, by Elder Luce, and were received into the fellowship of the Bush Run Baptist Church. After this Alexander began to call in question the scripturalness of certain Baptist views and usages, chiefly in relation to the personal agency of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, the consequent relation of a Christian experience before baptism and the effect of baptism itself. As nearly as the writer could express Mr. Campbell's views, after much conversation with him, he held: That no man can be born of God but by the word of truth as found in the Bible; that the Scriptures, being inspired by the Holy Spirit, the only agency of the Spirit which acts on the soul is exerted through the word of Scripture; that the act of regeneration is not completed until the soul obeys Christ in the act of baptism; and that, as baptism is Christ's appointed method of confessing him, the washing away of sin is connected with that act or evinced thereby. The Baptists from whom he retired also held to the full inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and that God addresses himself to the soul of man through that word, but that the Holy Spirit applies that word to the soul in so powerful a manner, by his direct and personal agency, as to lead it to a perfect trust on Christ for salvation and that then he is born from above, or regenerated. That when the Spirit bears witness with his spirit that he is a child of God, and he can testify of the grace of God in saving him, he has then become a fit subject for baptism; and so the act of baptism publicly attests his love for Christ, his obedience to him and the remission of his sins, as one who is dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God. The point of divergence between him and the Baptists, was so vital and radical, that every step which followed widened the distance. Mr. Campbell came to regard what is known as the relation of Christian experience, not only as savoring of mere impulse at the

best, but as often running into superstition and even fanaticism; while the Baptists insisted on satisfactory testimony from the Holy Spirit to the convert's heart, and then from his own lips to the Church, that a moral renovation was wrought in his whole moral nature by the Holy Spirit himself, in which work he had used the inspired word as his divine instrument in effecting salvation.

Of course, much warm controversy ensued, the convictions of each party deepened with the progress of the contest, divisions took place in Churches and Associations, the rent ran not only through Virginia but through the entire South and Southwest, and the two bodies appear to be about as far apart as ever, with this difference, that time and circumstances have softened old asperities and cooled the heat of fierce debate. The leaders in the combat were men of might on both sides. Mr. Campbell possessed a powerful intellect, which largely predominated over the emotional in his nature. He was of French descent on his mother's side; of Irish and Highland Scotch on his father's. He was very positive, unyielding, fearless and capable of wonderful endurance. Without being over-polite or ceremonious, his manners were bland and conciliating, while his mind was entirely self-directing, there was no show of vanity about him; and while not an orator in a high sense, his manner of speaking was prepossessing from the utter absence of cant in expression or whine in tone. There was a warm play of benevolence in his face and a frank open-heartedness in his speech, which was clothed in the dress of logic and armed with pointed artful sarcasm which seldom failed to influence his hearers.

Probably the nearest counterpart to himself whom he found amongst all his opponents, and who most counteracted his influence as a strong and cool reasoner, was Dr. Jeremiah B. Jeter, one of the broadest and best men that Virginia

ever produced either in the Baptist ministry or any other. He was a native of that State, born in 1802, and was baptized in 1821, addressing the crowd on the bank of the Otter River as he ascended from the water. He began to preach in Bedford County, and was the first missionary appointed by the General Association of Virginia, in 1823. He filled various pastorates in that State until 1835, when he became pastor of the First Church in Richmond, where he continued for fourteen years. He had baptized more than 1,000 persons before he went to Richmond, and was honored by the baptism of about the same number while in this Church. In 1849 he took charge of the Second Church in St. Louis, but returned to Richmond as the pastor of Grace Street Church in 1852. The last fourteen years of his life were spent as editor of the *Religious Herald*. As early as 1837 he had shown himself a master of the pen in his *Life of Clopton*, and this work was soon followed by the memoirs of Mrs. Schuck and of Andrew Broadus. All this had been but a training for his remarkable polemic work, in which he examined and answered the positions of Mr. Campbell. It is in this work chiefly that the fullness and roundness of his character appear. Clear, vigorous, courteous, unassuming and child-like, devoid of boastfulness, forgetful of himself and apparently unconscious of his own ability, he throws a blending of beautiful virtues into a majestic logic that no other writer has approached on that subject. He far excels Mr. Campbell in the graces of style and in suavity of spirit, while he is fully his equal in self-possession and out-spoken frankness, and more than his match in that manly argumentation which carries conviction to devout men. Dr. Jeter did splendid work in the pulpit and in building up the educational and missionary interests of the South. It is right and meet that a statue of this princely man should adorn the Memorial Hall at Richmond and that his

manuscripts should increase its wealth, but his truest likeness is traceable in his writings, and it will be bright and fresh there when the marble has moldered into dust. These two great men of Virginia have gone to give their account to God, and their memory is cherished by thousands of their friends, nor will either of them be soon forgotten as gladiators for the truth as they respectively saw truth. While the name of the one lives, that of the other can never be blotted out. This chapter may properly be closed by a sketch of another nobleman, who, though not a native of Virginia, is perhaps, taking him in all things, its first citizen at this time.

Jabez L.M. Curry, D.D., LL.D., was born in Lincoln County, Ga., June 5th, 1825. He was graduated from the University of Georgia in 1843, and from the Dane Law School, at Harvard University, in 1845. In 1847, '53 and '55 he served in Congress from Alabama. He was known there as an active friend of public and higher education and of internal improvements; as chairman of the proper committee he wrote a report and introduced a bill favoring geological survey. In 1856 he was chosen as Presidential Elector for Alabama, and in 1857-59 was again returned to Congress from Alabama. During the Civil War he served in the Confederate Congress and army, at its close was elected President of Howard College, in Alabama, and two years later, first Professor of English in Richmond College, then Professor of Constitutional and International Law, and also of Philosophy, in the same institution. When he resigned his professorships he was chosen President of its Board of Trustees. He was appointed General Agent of the Peabody Education Fund in 1881, and addressed every Southern Legislature, some of them two or three times, in behalf of public and normal schools. He is one of the most ardent and eloquent advocates of the education of the

Chapter 8 - Baptists of Virginia

Negro, as the best qualification for the maintenance and exercise of his fullest civil and constitutional rights. No man in our country has written, spoken and planned more earnestly in behalf of national aid for the removal and prevention of illiteracy.

In September, 1885, President Cleveland appointed him, without application on his own part, Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain. His reception by that court has been most cordial, and his labors there for the protection of American rights and the promotion of American commerce have been successful. His brethren repose great confidence in his practical wisdom and integrity. For this reason they commonly place him in responsible places when his presence is available. He is an able debater, perfectly conversant with parliamentary law. For several years he was Clerk, then Moderator of the Coosa River

Association, President of the Alabama Baptist State Convention, also of the Virginia General Association, and of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Convention. Dr. Curry is a powerful and enthusiastic preacher of the Gospel. He received the degree of D.D. in 1857 from the Mercer University, and has preached much; but, though often invited, he has uniformly declined to become a pastor. The address which he delivered before the Evangelical Alliance, in New York, in 1873, on the union of Church and State, excited universal attention, and the Liberation Society of Great Britain adopted and stereotyped it as one of their effective documents. The Rochester University conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws in 1872. He demands of all, and in himself presents, unsullied integrity in public life and the inseparableness of private and public morality.

The American Baptists

Chapter 9 - Baptists of Connecticut and New York

In considering the introduction and spread of Baptist principles into the other colonies, it will be proper to take them up in the chronological order in which their first Churches severally were formed. First of all, then, we have Connecticut, which colony lived under the charter of Charles II, as regards religious privileges, until 1818. As early as A.D. 1674 some Baptists of Rhode Island occasionally crossed the borders and immersed converts in Connecticut, who united with their Churches in Rhode Island. These, however, were regarded as unwarrantable innovations; they attracted the attention of the Standing Order (Presbyterial-Congregational), and the secular power was invoked to suppress them. One of these invasions took place at Waterford, but they were not oft-repeated. The ministers of the State Church were supported by levying and collecting their salaries regularly with other taxes. Trumbull informs us that before 1706 the persons of the ministers were free from all taxation, but their families and estates were taxable; in that year the Legislature exempted these from taxation. The law made the State Church the lawful congregation, and subjected all persons who neglected attendance there on 'the Lord's Day' to a fine of twenty shillings. It also forbade 'separate companies in private houses,' and inflicted a fine of ten pounds, with 'corporal punishment by whipping, not exceeding thirty stripes for each offense,' on every 'person, not being a lawful minister,' who 'shall presume to profane the holy sacraments by administering or making a show of administering them to any person or persons whatever, and being thereof convicted.' Connecticut and New Haven were separate governments till the reign of Charles II, when they were united under one charter. But this basis of government did not contain a single clause authorizing the Legislature to enact any

religious laws, establish any form of religion or any religious tests, and, properly speaking, the attempt to bind these on the colony was of itself a usurpation.

A few scattered Baptists in the south-eastern part of the colony humbly petitioned the General Court in 1704 for liberty to hold meetings and establish a Church in Groton. Their prayer seems not to have been noticed, but, nothing daunted, the same band sent a fraternal request to Valentine Wightman, a gifted young preacher in Rhode Island, to become their leader, and in 1705 he came and organized them into the First Baptist Church of Connecticut. This pioneer body numbered less than a score, but they were firm, united and liberal minded. They presented their brave young pastor at once with twenty acres of land, and Deacon William Stark erected upon it a suitable parsonage. It is still a flourishing Church in the village of Mystic, after a life of one hundred and eighty-one years. Wightman was a descendant of Edward, who was the last martyr under James I, and whose ashes fell amongst the fagots of Lichfield market-place in 1611. This first Baptist pastor of Connecticut was an extremely serene and quiet character, but his amiable soul flashed the fire of a true witness from his eye upon the bigots who would interfere with him. He possessed sound learning, great zeal and deep piety. A certain calm discretion made him symmetrical and consistent, and adapted him to cautious but intrepid leadership in his new and trying position. He was a close student of the Scriptures and a powerful preacher, caring tenderly for the flock of Christ. Then, he brought from his native commonwealth a mild tolerance of spirit for all men, with a love for their salvation which disarmed opposition. Yet no Church could legally exist without permission from the secular power; but it was doubly difficult to secure this tolerance for

The American Baptists

Baptists. Moreover, Wightman sought not the approbation of the neighboring clergy, for he contended that it was the right of every man to worship God as he pleased. His quiet firmness had much to do with that gradual relaxing of the law which at last permitted a man to show that he was a member in a Baptist Church and paid toward its support, and so could be furnished with a certificate of exemption from liability to distraint or imprisonment for refusing to pay the minister's tax of the State establishment.

Mr. Wightman and his flock never were so severely oppressed as were some Baptists in the colony. His sterling worth commanded the respect of the neighboring clergy from the first, and the enlightened tact by which he led his people often silenced the clamor of the Standing Order in that vicinity. But in many other places nothing could prevent seizure of the property of Non-conformists for refusing to pay the clerical tax, enforced as it often was by fiery zealots clothed with brief authority. At one time a number of Baptists, including their minister, were taken in the very act of worshiping God. They were promptly incarcerated in the New London county jail for attending a religious meeting 'contrary to law on the Sabbath day.' One of the prisoners was a babe at its mother's breast; the prison was fireless and the weather bitterly cold, yet the child lived and grew up to be a successful preacher of the Baptist faith, for which he innocently suffered.

Ebenezer Frothingham, of Middletown, wrote a book in 1767, in which he says that as a Separate he was confined in Hartford prison for nearly five months, for nothing but exhorting and warning the people after the public worship was done and the assembly dismissed. And while confined there five others were imprisoned for the same crime. He also says that

building their meeting-house, altho' he is a Baptist, is accounted a harmless, godly man; and he has plead the privilege of a Baptist through all the courts, and been at great expense, without relief, till at last the Assembly has given him a mark in his hand, and notwithstanding this, they have thrust him to prison for former rates, with several aggravations which I shall omit. But as to what the Constitution does to relieve the poor deacon, he may there die, and the cry of blood, blood, go up into the ears of a just God.'

In other cases, venerable ministers of the Gospel were whipped at the town-post, or at the tail of an ox-cart, as they were driven through the town. Sometimes they were placarded and placed on horseback, and otherwise ignominiously treated for preaching Christ. Nathan Jewett, of Lyme; a member of the Baptist Church there, was expelled from the Legislature because he was not of the Standing Order. Still, one Church slowly grew up after another. In 1710 a Baptist Church was organized at Waterford; in 1735 another in Wallingford; one in Stonington, one in Lyme and one in Colchester the same year, and one at Saybrook in 1744. The first Baptist meetings were not held in Norwich till 1770, and in other large towns it was much later still before Churches were formed. When the minister's tax was to be collected, the dissenting layman's cow or the contents of his corn-crib were seized and taken to the town post to be sold, and the contumacious delinquent considered himself fortunate if he escaped the stocks, always found hard by the sign-post or the jail. Here follows one of the old forms under which these outrages were committed:

'LEVY.'

To Samuel Perking, of Windham, in Windham County, a Collector of Society Taxes in the first Society in Windham:

'Greeting: By authority of the State of Connecticut, you are hereby commanded forthwith to levy and collect of the persons

'Young Deacon Drake, of Windsor, now in Hartford prison for the ministers' rates and

Chapter 9 - Baptists of Connecticut and New York

named in the foregoing list herewith committed to you, each one his several proportion as therein set down, of the sum total of such list, being a rate agreed upon by the inhabitants of said Society for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said Society, and to deliver and pay-over the sums which you shall collect to the Treasurer of said Society within sixty days next coming; and if any person shall neglect or refuse to pay the sum at which he is assessed; you are hereby commanded to distrain the goods, chattels, or lands of such person so refusing; and the same being disposed of as the law directs, return the overplus, if any, to the respective owners; and for want of such goods, chattels, or lands whereon to make distress, you are to take the body or bodies of the persons so refusing, and them commit to the keeper of the gaol in said County of Windham within the prison, who is hereby commanded to receive and safe keep them until they pay and satisfy the aforesaid sums at which they are respectively assessed, together with your fees, unless said assessment, or any part thereof, be legally abated. Dated at Windham, this 12th day of September, 1794.'

'JABEZ CLARK, Just. Peace'

The efforts of the Baptists to throw off this yoke are matters of well-attested history. They adopted resolutions in Churches and Associations, they carried up petitions from year to year to the law-making bodies, and sent the ablest counsel, at heavy expense, to seek the redress of grievances and demand complete equality before the law, for many years. Indeed, the 'Baptist Petition,' as it was called, came to be almost a by-word amongst the State officers, and when at last, in 1818, the rights of conscience were secured in the new constitution, it was a matter of surprise, and most of all were the Baptists themselves surprised, to find that the article which changed the fundamental law on that subject was drawn by Rev. Asahel Morse, one of their own ministers from Suffield.

As in Massachusetts, so in Connecticut, the New Light or Separate movement under Whitefield and Edwards resulted in the rapid

advancement of the Baptist cause. For about twenty years, from 1740 to 1760, perpetual excitement abounded and about forty Separatist Churches were established, taking the very best elements, in many cases, out of the State Churches. In process of time a number of them became Baptist Churches bodily, and in other cases they gradually blended with the Baptists, for their cause was one in essence. They demanded deliverance from the curse of the Half-way Covenant and freedom to worship God as regenerate people. So enraged did the State Churches and the Legislature become, that they repealed a former act under which Baptists and others of 'sober consciences' had enjoyed partial liberty, and then, as Trumbull says, there was 'no relief for any person dissenting from the established mode of worship in Connecticut. The Legislature not only enacted these severe and unprecedented laws, but they proceeded to deprive of their offices such of the justices of the peace and other officers as were New Lights, as they were called, or who favored then-cause.' The two Clevelands, students, and their tutors were expelled from Yale College by President Clapp because they attended a private meeting 'for divine worship, carried on principally by one Solomon Paine, a lay exhorter, on several Sabbaths in September and October last.' These two young men pleaded that this was the meeting where their godly father went, and for this crime of bowing before God they were excluded from that honorable institution. The same spirit prevailed in the Congregational Churches. According to Whittemore, the Church at Middletown had for some years a few members in its fellowship who entertained Baptist views. But at a meeting held August 9th, 1795, it passed the following: 'When members of this Church shall renounce infant baptism and embrace the Baptist principles and practice baptism by immersion, they shall be considered by that act as withdrawing their fellowship from

The American Baptists

this Church, and we consider our covenant obligations with them as Church members dissolved.' When it is remembered that their membership was not of choice but of law, we see the injustice of this act. 'Rev. Stephen Parsons, who had been pastor of the Church for seven years, announced one Sabbath morning that he had embraced the opinions of the Baptists and was immediately dismissed...He with a number of his brethren and sisters withdrew, were soon after baptized, and on the 29th of October, 1795, a meeting was held in the house of a Mr. Doolittle for the purpose of recognizing the Church.' The venerable Judge Wm. H. Potter, an alumnus of Yale, thus eloquently sets forth the temper of the times. He says:

'The unfortunate Separates were pursued into every calling, hunted out of every place of trust, hauled before clergy and Church, dragged before magistrates, and suffered without stint and without much complaint countless civil and ecclesiastical penalties, as heretics or felons, but oppression only confirmed their faith and thrust them into a closer union with their Baptist fellow-sufferers who, as in duty bound, joyfully espoused the cause and rights of the Separates. And why should they not fraternize? The Baptists, upon whom persecution had well-nigh exhausted its impotent attempts, either to extirpate or seduce, were, to be sure, regarded by the hierarchy as impracticables, and had been invidiously permitted under the Act of the first year of William and Mary to organize Churches. But they were still laboring under many legal impediments and more prejudices. Their memories, if not their backs, were still smarting under the pungent discipline of the same hierarchy. Their preachers had been familiar with fines, forfeitures and prisons, and their people with distrains, odium and disfranchisement. Herein there must have been a common sympathy. Then, the soul-stirring doctrines of New Lights were already the cherished doctrines of the Baptists. The same annunciation of the rich, free and sovereign

grace of God, and the doctrines of the cross which Whitefield and Wheelock made on a wider field and with such signal success, were identical with those of Wightman and the Callenders. The Separates, therefore, had little to sacrifice in coining to the Baptists.'

The law treated the Separates as malefactors and outcasts, and some of them were handled so much worse than many of the Baptists that the latter sympathized with them, succored them and threw open their doors to make them welcome as brethren in like tribulation.

At first, when a Baptist and Separate Church became one, or when large numbers of Separates united with a Baptist Church, the chief difference between the two was found in the lax views of the Separates on the subject of communion. The Supper had always been grossly perverted by the Standing Order to ecclesiastical-politico uses, and these notions the so-called New Lights brought with them to the Baptists. They could not easily rid themselves of this relic of State Church life, but in process of time they adopted healthier views and, falling into Baptist line, fully embraced their principles. While the few Baptist ministers of that day were not men of learning, they commonly possessed a fair public school education, which they used with sound sense in laying broad foundations for their free and independent Churches. They had slight salaries or none at all, which, for the general good of Baptist interests, left them free to devote a portion of their time to other fields besides their own pastorates, doing the work of evangelists and planting new Churches in many places. Wightman did much of this work, extending his labors as far as New York city. Three generations of Wightmans succeeded to the pastorate of the First Church, Groton, covering, with short intervals, a century and a quarter. Our few and feeble Churches were thoroughly evangelical and simple in their utterances of divine truth, and their Declarations

of Faith were little else than a succession of quotations from the Bible, whose text alone was their creed. Their general practice also was as consistent as their doctrines, but at one time they partook to some extent in their worship of the general excitement which attended the preaching of Whitefield, Davenport and the elder Edwards. No part of America was more deeply moved than Connecticut under the labors of these men. Whitefield's preaching, especially, agitated the Churches of the Standing Order to their center. They had foolishly closed all their pulpits against him, and multitudes assembled in the open air to listen to his preaching. A fair proportion of their clergy, however, sympathized with him and went with their people, nor were they alarmed at those physical and so-called fanatical manifestations which accompanied his preaching, described by Edwards. Often a subtile but irresistible influence would fall upon his congregations, somewhat resembling a panic on a battlefield. Multitudes would surge back and forth, would raise a simultaneous cry of agony, many would fall to the earth, remaining long in a state of unconsciousness, and then awoke as from a trance-like state enraptured with an ecstatic joy.

The Baptists, with such of the Standing Order as co-operated with Whitefield and his immediate followers, all blended in his support, and wonderful things occurred through this new discipleship. It is stated on good authority that the parsonage at Center Groton was the scene of one of the most remarkable sermons of this great preacher. The upper windows of the house were removed and a platform raised in front, facing a large yard full of forest trees. When Whitefield passed through the window to this stand and cast his eye over the multitude, he saw a number of young men who, imitating Zaccheus in the sycamore, had climbed these trees and were perched on their limbs. The kind hearted orator asked them to come down, saying: 'Sometimes

the powder of God falls on these occasions and takes away the might of strong men. I wish to benefit your souls and not have your bodies fall out of these trees.' He expected to see them come down to the ground as birds that were shot; and choosing the valor of discretion they came down, only to be prostrated under the sermon. Great numbers of his hearers went home to lead new lives, and it is said that more than one of these young men became preachers of the new faith.

No Baptist Church in Connecticut fought a nobler battle for life and freedom than that at Norwich. Dr. Lord was the pastor of the State Church there, and appears to have been a very excellent man. He was inclined at first to work with the revivalists, but the breaking up of the ancient order of things amongst what were known as the Old Lights alarmed him, and the bent of circumstances forced him into ultra-conservatism. Then he began to oppress and persecute those of his congregation who took the other side, and the result was that a large secession from his Church formed a new Separatist body. In due time a Baptist Church sprang chiefly out of this and Norwich became a large source of Baptist power. Poor Parson Lord had hard times generally in these contests and, in particular, was compelled to collect his own taxes. Denison tells us that 'he called upon a Mr. Colher, who was a barber, when the following dialogue ensued:

Dr. L. "Mr. Colher, I have a small bill against you."

Mr. C. "A bill against me, Dr. Lord? for what?"

Dr. L. "Why, your rate for my preaching."

Mr. C. "For your preaching? Why, I have never heard you. I don't recollect that I ever entered your meeting-house."

Dr. L. "That's not my fault, Mr. Colher, the meeting-house was open."

The American Baptists

Mr. C. "Very well. But, look here; I have a small bill against you, Dr. Lord."

Dr. L. "A bill against me? for what?"

Mr. C. "Why, for barbering."

Dr. L. "For barbering? I never before entered your shop."

Mr. C. "That's not my fault, Dr. Lord, my shop was open!"

The Norwich Church prospered, and our brethren met for worship in their own houses until want of room compelled them first to gather in a rope-walk, and then to erect a meeting-house of their own. But they, as well as the Separates, were slow of heart to learn all that the Baptists taught them, and it is quite delicious to know that they burnt their own fingers in consequence. In those days, when the State Churches wanted to build a meeting-house, they commonly asked the Legislature for a Lottery Grant on which to raise money. The Norwich Baptists, thinking it no harm for them to be as ridiculous as other respectable folk, applied to the General Assembly for such a Grant. Whereupon, that August body refused: first, because the Baptists did not indorse the Ecclesiastical Laws; secondly, because they were not known in law as a denomination; thirdly, because Rev. Mr. Sterry, the Baptist pastor at Norwich, was the co-editor of a Republican paper. For these reasons, our brethren were informed that they could not be allowed to gamble like good, legal and orthodox saints. This word to the wise had a wholesome effect upon them, for although they have now built a number of excellent church edifices, and have liberally helped others to do the same, they have never once since asked for a State Lottery to help them in building houses for God. Few States in our Union can show a nobler list of pioneer Baptist pastors or a more illustrious line of successors than Connecticut. Amongst the

first we have the three Wightmans, Valentine, Timothy and Gano; then follow the four Burrowses, Silas, Amos, Peleg and Roswell. The three Allens follow: Ichabod, Rufus and Stephen; and the two Bolles, David and Matthew, the Palmers and the Rathbuns: together with Backus and Baldwin and a list that cannot now be named. In later times we have had Knapp and Cushman, Swan and Hodge, Ives and Miller, Turnbull and Phelps, Palmer and Lathrop, their illustrious peers. Many of these have long since entered into their Master's joy, and over a few others the sheen of their holy Home begins to glow, falling softly on their scant locks. To these their departed brethren begin to look like shining ones sent back with lamps of Christ's trimming to escort them to the celestial gate. Heaven bless the waiting band, and when their work is done give them a triumphant entrance into the city of the great King. The Baptists of Connecticut now number 6 Associations, 122 ordained ministers; 124 churches and 21,666 members.

NEW YORK. The Documentary History of New York first mentions Baptists in 1644, and calls them 'Mnists,' Mennonists or Mennonites, but does not tell us in what part of the colony they were found. The Director and Council of New Netherland treated them harshly enough. On the 6th of June, 1641, they gave the 'free exercise of religion' to the Church of England, and October 10th, 1645, granted a special charter to the town of Flushing with the same right. They soon found, however; that sundry heretics, Independents, of Middleburg (Newtown), and Lutherans, of New Amsterdam, were using the same liberty, and they took the alarm. On February 1st, 1686, the authorities decreed that all 'conventicles and meetings' held in the province, whether public or private, should be 'absolutely and expressly forbidden;' that only the 'Reformed Divine service, as this is observed and enforced according to the Synod

of Dootrecht,' should be held,

'Under the penalty of one hundred pounds Flemish, to be forfeited by all those who, being unqualified, take upon themselves, either on Sundays or other days, any office, whether of preacher, reader or singer, in such meetings differing from the customary and legal assemblies, and twenty-five like pounds to be forfeited by every one, whether man or woman, married or unmarried, who is found in such meetings.'

They disclaimed all intention to put any constraint of conscience in violation of 'previously granted patents,' and imprisoned some Lutherans, which act excited such indignation that they were compelled, June 14th, 1656, to permit the Lutherans to worship in their own houses. Not content with this, they threw themselves into direct collision with the town of Flushing, in violation of their patent granting religious freedom to that town. Under its charter Flushing, by resolution, claimed the right of Quakers and other sects to worship God within their jurisdiction without restraint. On the 26th of March, 1658, therefore, the New Netherland authorities passed an ordinance annulling the right of Flushing to hold town meetings, forbidding heresy in the town and requiring its magistrates to select 'a good, honest, pious and orthodox minister,' subject to the approval of the provincial authorities, and requiring each land-owner of that town to pay twelve stivers annually for his support, together with tenths if necessary, and that all who would not comply with these demands within six weeks should lose their goods, which than be sold, and they must take themselves 'out of this government.'

We have seen in a previous chapter that many of the New England colonists fled to the Dutch for liberty to worship God and keep a good conscience. Amongst these were some of the friends of Hanserd Knollys in 1641, and a little later Lady Deborah Moody, widow of Sir

Henry of Garsden, in Wiltshire. She, together with Mrs. King, of Swampscott, and the wife of John Tillton, was tried at the Quarterly Court, December, 1642, 'for houldinge that the baptizing of infants is noe ordinance of God.' It does not appear that she was actually banished from Massachusetts, but having first fled from England on account of persecution, and finding herself an object of arraignment and reproach in her new home, for the free expression of her religious views, her sensitive and high spirit revolted, and she determined to abandon Massachusetts and seek peace amongst strangers. In 1643 she went to New Amsterdam, thirteen years before the New Netherland authorities issued their tyrannical decree. Governor Winthrop tells us that she did this 'against the advice of all her friends.' Many others affected with Anabaptism removed thither also. She was after excommunicated from the Salem Church. In a letter written by Endicott to Winthrop, dated Salem, the 22d of the second month, 1644, he says that Mr. Norrice had informed him that she intended to return, and he advises against her return, 'unless shee will acknowledge her ewill in opposing the Churches & leave her opinions behinde her, ffor she is a dangerous woeman. My brother Ludlow writt to mee that, by meancs of a booke she sent to Mrs. Eaton, *shee questions her owns baptisme*, it is verie doubtfull whether shee will be re-claymed, shee is so far ingaged.' On her way from Massachusetts she stopped for a time at New Haven, where she made several converts to her new views and fell into fresh difficulties in consequence. As Winthrop tells us, Mrs. Eaton, wife of the first Governor of New Haven Colony, was one of these converts. She also was a lady of high birth and culture, the daughter of an English Bishop. Davenport, her pastor, was at unwearied pains to reclaim her from the 'error' of 'imagining that pedobaptism is unlawful.' It was alleged against her, that she importuned

The American Baptists

Lady Moody 'to lend her a book made by A.R.' The records of the Congregational Church at New Haven show that she was severely handled for stoutly denying that 'Baptism has come in the place of circumcision, and is to be administered unto infants.' By some Lady Moody has been called a follower of George Fox, but this was three years before he began to preach in England. On the southwest coast of Long Island, near New Amsterdam, a settlement had been formed in 1643, which Governor Kieft had named Gravesend, after a Dutch town on the Maas. Lady Moody took a patent of laud there of him, December 19th, 1645, which, among other things, guaranteed 'the free libertie of conscience according to the costome of Holland, without molestation or disturbance from any madgistrate or madgistrates, or any other ecclesiastical minister that may pretend jurisdiction over them.' For a time, her religious sentiments disturbed her amicable relations with the Dutch authorities, without regard to her patent. Here she died, it is supposed, about 1659. Many others of like sentiments gathered about her, 'with liberty to constitute themselves a body politic as freemen of the Province and town of Gravesende,' according to the patent. The learned James W. Gerard says: 'The settlers at Gravesend seem to have been generally affected with Anabaptist views, and to have had no settled Church.' Clearly, there were two Baptist ministers at Flushing in those days, the first in order of time being Rev. Francis Doughty. Mandeville, in his 'Flushing Past and Present,' says that he fled from 'the troubles in England, and found that he had got out of the frying-pan into the fire.' He preached at Lynn and Taunton, Mass., 'and denied baptism to infants.' At Taunton he was dragged out of the public assembly and brought before the magistrates, charged with saying that 'Abraham ought to have been baptized.' He then fled to Long Island and became the first pastor at Flushing, but in

1656 went to Virginia. 'He was unquestionably the first religious teacher in Flushing, and had adopted Baptist views of the ordinance of baptism.'

Aside from Lady Moody and Mr. Doughty, the first full account that we have from the records of New Motherland that there were Baptists in the colony, is found in an official paper on 'The State of Religion,' drawn up 'and signed by two clergymen of the Reformed Church, Megapolensis and Drissius. It is dated at 'Amsterdam, in N. Netherland,' the 5th of August, 1657, and is addressed to the 'Classis of Amsterdam.' They report Long Island religion as in a sad condition.

At 'Gravesend are reported Mennonites; yea, they, for the most part, reject infant baptism, the Sabbath, the office of preacher and the teachers of God's word, saying that through these have come all sorts of contention into the world. Whenever they come together the one or the other reads something for them. At Flushing they hitherto had a Presbyterian preacher who conformed to our Church, but many of them became endowed with divers opinions...They absented themselves from preaching, nor would they pay the preacher his promised stipend. The said preacher was obliged to leave the place and repair to the English Virginias...Last year a fomenter of evil came there. He was a cobbler from Rhode Island, in New England, and stated that he was commissioned by Christ. He began to preach at Flushing and then went with the people into the river and dipped them. This becoming known here, the fiscaal proceeded thither and brought him along. He was banished the province.'

The same paper states that at Middleburg (now Newtown) and at 'Heemstede' there were a number of people who were willing to listen to the preaching of Richard Denton at the Dutch Church: 'When he began to baptize the children of such parents as were not members of the Church they sometimes burst out of the church.' 'The cobbler,' a mere term of contempt, who

Chapter 9 - Baptists of Connecticut and New York

'dipped' his converts at Flushing 'last year,' that is, in 1656, was Rev. William Wickenden, of Providence. He was one of the first settlers of that city, resided there in 1636, signed the first compact in 1637, was a member of the Legislature in 1648, and from 1651 to 1655, again 1664, and died in 1669. In 1656 he visited Flushing, preached, immersed his converts in the river, and administered the Lord's Supper. Both Broadhead and O'Callagan give a full account of his treatment in consequence. Under date of November 8th, 1656, O'Callagan says: 'The Baptists at Flushing were the next to feel the wrath of the law. William Hallett, sheriff of that place, "had dared to collect conventicles in Ills house, and to permit one William Wickendam [properly Wickenden] to explain and comment on God's Holy Word, and to administer sacraments, though not called thereto by any civil or clerical authority." He had, moreover, assisted at such meeting and afterward "accepted from the said Wickendam's hands the bread in the form and manner the Lord's Supper is usually celebrated." For this violation of the statute Hallett was removed from office and fined fifty pounds, failing to pay which he was to be banished.' On the 8th of November, 1656, the General Assembly of New Netherland 'ordained' that Wickenden should be condemned to pay a fine of one hundred pounds Flemish and be banished out of the province of New Netherland, 'the aforesaid Wickendam to remain a prisoner till the fine and cost of the process shall be paid.'

The Council being informed, however, by reliable parties, that he was a very poor man, 'with a wife and many children, by profession a cobbler, which trade he neglects, so that it will be impossible to collect anything from him,' the fine and costs were remitted, and he was condemned on the 11th of November 'to immediate banishment, under condition that if ever he be seen again in the province of New

Netherland he shall be arrested and kept in confinement till the fine and costs are paid in full.' Like other religious tyrants, the more the Dutch authorities persecuted the heretics the worse off they found themselves, and the more indignant they became. Hence, on September 21st, 1662, they say that because they

'Find by experience that their hitherto issued publications and edicts against conventicles and prohibited assemblies are not observed and obeyed as they ought, therefore, by these presents, they are not only renewed but enlarged in manner following. Like as they have done heretofore, so they prohibit and interdict as yet that besides the Reformed worship and service no conventicles or meetings shall be kept in this province, whether it be in houses, barns, ships, barks; nor in the woods nor fields, upon forfeiture of fifty guldens for the first time, for every person, whether man or woman or child that shall have been present at such prohibited meetings, and twice as much for every person, whether it be man or woman or child, that has exhorted or taught in such prohibited meetings, or shall have lent his house, barn, or any place to that purpose; for ye second time twice as much, for the third time four times as much, and arbitrary punishment besides.'

A further provision prohibited the importation, circulation or reception of any books, writings or letters, deemed 'erroneous,' fining the importers and circulators a hundred gulden, and the receivers fifty gulden. From this time onward there are numerous indications that many individual Baptists were found around Gravesend, Newtown and Flushing, and some signs that now and then one of the Mennonites from Long Island had crossed the river into what are now New York and Westchester Counties, but it is not likely that they had any visible Church existence.

The next trace of Baptist life that we find in New York came also from the East. Nicholas Eyers, supposed to have been a native-born

citizen, a brewer, residing 'in the broad street of this city, between the house of John Michel Evers and Mr. John Spratt,' invited Valentine Wightman, of Groton, Conn., to come and preach in his house. Evers shows in his petition to the Governor that in February, 1715, his house had been registered by the Quarter Sessions 'for an Anabaptist meetinghouse,' and 'that he had been a public preacher to a Baptist congregation within this city for four years.' There is a perplexity of dates here, as between 1711, when he is said to have been a Baptist preacher, and 1714, when his name appears in the list of the baptized, which the writer sees no way of reconciling without further data. In 1711 or 1712 Wightman began a series of preaching visits, continuing them for about two years, and in 1714 he baptized Nicholas Evers and eleven others. At first it was resolved that for fear of the rabble these twelve converts than be baptized in the night and the company went to the river, where the five females received the ordinance. At that point Mr. Evers was seized with the conviction that they were doing wrong in shunning publicity, he remembered the words of the Lord Jesus: 'No man doeth any thing in secret, when he himself seeketh to be known openly.' He, therefore, consulted with the other six brethren and they agreed to postpone their baptism till morning. The next day they waited on Burnet, the Governor, with a request for protection; this he not only gave them but went to the river side with many of the most respectable citizens to witness the ordinance. All stood reverently, and at its close the Governor remarked: 'This was the ancient manner of baptizing, and is, in my opinion, much preferable to the practice of modern times.' In 1715 the Quarter Sessions licensed Evers' house for a Baptist meeting place. On January 1, 1720, he seems to have hired another place of meeting, and he asked the Governor to permit him to exercise the functions 'of a minister within this

city to a Baptist congregation and to give him protection therein,' under the Act of Toleration. Rip Van Dam, 'one of His Majesty's Council for the Province of New York,' had rented this place to Evers, 'only to be a publick meeting place of the Baptists wherein to worship Almighty God.' On the 13th of the same month the Mayor, Recorder and Aldermen certified 'that to the best of our knowledge and understanding he is blameless and free from any notorious and public slander and vice, has given himself the good name and reputation of his neighbors of being a sober, just and honest man, and is said to be an Anabaptist as to his profession in religion.' January 23d, 1721, Governor Burnet gave him a permit to preach under the laws of William and Mary. This curious document begins thus: 'Whereas, Mr. Nich. Evers, brewer, a freeman and inhabitant of ye City of New York, pretending to be at present a teacher or preacher of a congregation of Anabaptists, which has had its beginning about five years ago within this city and has so continued hitherto.'

This date implies that the congregation had taken a somewhat settled form in 1715, but Parkinson states that the Church was not constituted nor Evers ordained till September, 1724, when Elders Valentine Wightman, of Groton, and Daniel Wightman, of Newport, conducted the services. This Church was so prospered that they bought a piece of ground on 'Golden Hill' and built a meeting-house in 1728. A map made from a survey by Wm. Bradford, dated 1728, shows that 'Golden Hill' took its rise at Queen Street (now Pearl) and continued up John Street to William, and also shows this meeting-house to have been located on the west side of Cliff, a little north of the northwest corner of Cliff, apparently on the property now occupied by Messrs. Phelps, Dodge, & Co. Benedict says that he found a letter amongst the papers of Backus, addressed by Elder James Brown to his Church in Providence, asking aid

toward paying the debt on this church edifice, which had cost a considerable sum. He stated that the Rhode Island brethren had helped them the year before, but that the wealthiest member of the New York Church having left them, and the rest being poor, they were unable to discharge their debt. Mr. Brown thought that £25 or £30 would be the just proportion of the Church in Providence, and he subscribed £1 thereof. A number of others gave 'thirteen barrels of cider' Between the brewer of New York and the cider-mills of Providence they were bound to float that church building on Golden Hill; yet the plan would not work. Evers removed to Newport in 1731, where he died, and John Stephens took his place in New York. But he soon removed to South Carolina. Then one of the trustees claimed the church building and sold it as private property, when the Church, which had existed about eight years and consisted of twenty-four members, disbanded. This closed the history of the first General Baptist Church in New York city.

That which is now the First Baptist Church in that city was organized on June 10th, 1762, and under most interesting circumstances, especially interesting because its history is indirectly connected with Roger Williams through Long Island and Block Island. In 1661 a company of sixteen Baptist emigrants from England, who found that they could not enjoy religious liberty in Massachusetts, united in purchasing Block Island and settled there. They soon applied to Roger Williams and John Clarke for aid and counsel, and through their influence, in 1663, Block Island was admitted to share the privileges of the charter which Rhode Island had secured from Charles II. In 1664 a deputation was sent from Block Island to the General Assembly of Rhode Island to ask for civil protection. Their request was referred to a committee, of which Roger Williams was chairman, who reported, that as his majesty had

granted in the charter 'that no person within the said colony at any time hereafter shall be in any way molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any difference in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of the said colony,' the people of Block Island were entitled to the same rights. The islanders, therefore, organized a miniature democracy for local civil government, and, in 1665, sent their first representatives to the Rhode Island General Court. In civil polity it adopted the principles of Roger Williams, and in the exercise of its religious freedom it introduced worship after the order observed by Baptists. The sixteen original proprietors set apart a portion of land to be known as the Ministers' Lot, for the maintenance of that worship.

James Sands, one of the first settlers and the first representative from Block Island in the Rhode Island Assembly, was an 'Anabaptist,' and Niles, his grandson, the historian of the Island, says that 'he did not differ in religious belief from the other settlers.' For about ninety years lay preachers, taken from amongst themselves, continued regular worship after the Baptist order, and without the formal organization of a Church. Until that time they met in each other's houses, but then they built a meeting-house, and from that period to this they have built seven in succession. In 1759 they engaged Rev. David Sprague to preach for them: 'So long as said Sprague shall serve the inhabitants of the town by preaching to them the Gospel of Christ according to the Scriptures of truth, making them and them only the rule of his faith, doctrine and practice.' A Baptist Church was organized on Block Island October 3d, 1772, with Elder Sprague as pastor and Thomas Dodge as deacon. They adopted the ordinary articles of faith used at that time, that on the ordinances being the ninth and reading thus: 'We believe that baptism and the Lord's Supper are

The American Baptists

ordinances of Christ to be continued in his Church and practiced by believers, after his own example and in obedience to his commandments, until his second coming, and that the former is requisite to the latter.' From that day there has been a Baptist Church on the island, and none other; and now, out of a resident population of about 1,500 the Baptists number fully 500 members in communion. Livermore, a late historian, says that,

'In no part of the world, perhaps, has religious freedom been maintained so purely for two hundred years as on Block Island. Here it has never been disturbed by any civil enactments. Here no ecclesiastical authority has ever infringed upon private opinions of religious faith and practice. Here the Church has never felt the overruling power of bishops or synod. Here no religious duties have been enforced upon helpless infants. Here the ordinances have ever been administered in their primitive simplicity. Here the acts of sprinkling, pouring and signing with the cross have never been witnessed. Here the minister has no more ruling authority in the Church than the youngest member. No authority is recognized in it except that which comes from the Scriptures.'

Twelve years after the organization of this Church Thomas Dodge became its pastor, and some of the best families in New England have sprung from this settlement, especially the descendants of the Sands, Ray, Terry, Rathbone, Dodge and Niles. Roger Williams was deeply concerned in the welfare of this little republic, was intimate with its early settlers, and Simon Ray, Jr. married his granddaughter. Thomas Dodge, grandson of Tristram Dodge, one of the original settlers of Block Island, settled at Cow Neck, Long Island, about 1705-10, and was soon followed by Samuel, another grandson. Thomas, it is supposed, built the old homestead still found on Dodge Pond, and from there the family spread to Cow Bay, where we find Dodge

Island, near to Sands Point, named after John Sands, who was one of Elder Sands' family from Block Island. Jeremiah Dodge, a great-grandson of the original Tristram, was born at Cow Neck, May, 1716; he was a shipbuilder, having learned his trade from his brother, Wilkie. He removed to New York to follow his business not far from the years 1737-40, and died there in 1800. He brought the old Baptist principles of the family with him, and in 1745 we find the few scattered Baptists of New York meeting in his house and that of Joseph Meeks for prayer-meetings, Dodge and Dr. Robert North, a former member of the disbanded Church, being the leaders of the little congregation.

Joseph Meeks was converted in 1745, and Elder Benjamin Miller, of Scotch Plains, N.J., came to New York to baptize him. Soon John Pyne, a licentiate living at Fishkill, was invited to come to their help. In 1750 Mr. Pyne died, and Elder James Carman, of Cranberry, near Hightstown, N.J., visited them and baptized several. They numbered thirteen members in 1753, and became a branch of the Scotch Plains Church. Mr. Miller came to break bread to them once in three mouths. Their numbers increased so rapidly that they were obliged to hire a room to contain the congregation. In what is now called William Street (between Fulton and John) there was a rigging-loft, on which hung a large sign of a horse and cart, from which the street was known as Cart-and-Horse Lane. Here they met from three to four years, when its owner sold it and they returned to Mr. Meeks' house, where they met about a year longer. They then purchased ground and built the second Baptist meeting-house on Golden Hill, and entered it in March, 1760. A map in Valentine's Manuals shows the location of this building to have been in Gold Street, on the west side, just south of the south-west corner of what is now Fulton. Their membership having increased to twenty-seven, they took their letters from Scotch Plains and,

Chapter 9 - Baptists of Connecticut and New York

with the assistance of Benjamin Miller and John Gano, were constituted a Church in 1762, adopting the London Confession of 1688. On the same day they elected Mr. Gano their pastor. As he was one of the first men of his times a brief sketch of his life may be necessary here.

John Gano was a direct descendant of the Huguenots of France, his grandfather, Francis, being obliged to fly from persecution in the Isle of Guernsey in consequence of the bloody edict revoking the Edict of Nantz. He settled in New Rochelle, in the State of New York. His son, Daniel, lived at Hopewell, N.J., and was the father of John, who was born at Hopewell, July 22d, 1727. While quite young John united with the Baptist Church there, and was ordained by that body May 29th, 1754, Isaac Eaton preaching the sermon. Before his ordination he had gone with Mr. Miller and Mr. Thomas on a tour into Virginia, and while there had followed what he believed to be a divine impulse to preach. On returning, his Church called him to account for such disorder, but before proceeding to condemn him, asked him to preach before them, hence his ordination; and at the next meeting of the Philadelphia Association he was sent on a mission to the South. There he traveled extensively as far as South Carolina. While in the back settlements of Virginia he lodged with a family and overheard one of them say: 'This man talks like one of the Joneses.' On inquiry he was told that they were a family living over twenty miles thence who did nothing but pray and talk about Jesus Christ. He said: 'I determined to make it my next day's ride and see my own likeness.' He found a large family, many of whom had been lately converted, engaged in worship. The sick father was lying before the fire groaning with pain, and Gano asked him how he did? He replied: 'Oh! I am in great pain.' 'I am glad of it,' said the young preacher. The old man demanded with spirit what he meant. He answered: 'Whom the Lord

loveth he chasteneth,' and the sick man fell in love with him.

On reaching North Carolina, in company with another young man, they arrived at a plantation where they were invited to stay all night. The planter asked him 'if he was a trader,' to which he answered 'yes.' He then asked him how he succeeded. Gano replied, not so well as he wished. Probably the goods did not suit. The preacher said that no one had complained of that. The planter suggested that he might be holding his goods too high, to which his friend replied that any one might have them below their own price. The man said that he would trade on these terms. Gano then asked him: 'If gold tried in the fire, yea, that which was better than the fine gold, wine and milk, durable riches and righteousness, without money and without price, would suit him?' 'O' said the planter, 'I believe you are a minister,' and then he declared to him the freeness and fullness of grace.

On arriving at Charleston, he preached there for Mr. Hart; and in his account of the services Mr. Gano writes: 'When I arose to speak, the sight of so brilliant an audience, among whom were twelve ministers and one of whom was Mr. Whitefield, for a moment brought the fear of man upon me; but, blessed be the Lord! I was soon relieved from this embarrassment. The thought passed my mind, I had none to fear and obey but the lord.' On his return to North Carolina, during the French War, he was informed that he was to be seized as a spy; but when he reached the place, instead of passing through secretly, he stopped at the public house and asked the landlord whether the people would come to hear a sermon on a week-day. The man replied that shortly there was to be a general muster there for the county, and Gano sent to the colonel who was to arrest him, to know if it would be pleasant to him to have a short sermon addressed to the regiment before military duty. They all paid profound attention

The American Baptists

but one man, to whom Gano said that he was ashamed of him and wondered that his officers would bear with him. The colonel thanked the preacher, rebuked the man, and the evangelist pushed on his way. On reaching the Blue Ridge he entered a house in a storm, the owner of which was alarmed and asked him if he was 'a press-master.' He replied that he was. In great alarm the man wished to know whether he 'took married men.' Gano told him that he surely did, that his Master's service was good, with high wages, and he wanted his wife and children to enlist also. The man was very uneasy, however, while he was exhorted to volunteer for Christ. On reaching New Jersey he first settled at Morristown for two years, and then at Yadkin, N.C., whence he was obliged to flee before the Cherokee Indians in the ravages of war. Shortly after this he took the New York pastorate, in which he remained five and twenty years with the most marked success, when he removed to Kentucky; where he died at Frankfort in 1804. We shall meet him again in the Revolutionary War. It is but needful to add here that he was one of the most remarkable men in America in all the resources which native strength, sound judgment, wit, ingenuity, retentive memory, zeal and godliness furnish in times which try men's souls.

The First Church prospered so largely under Mr. Gano's ministry that the meeting-house was enlarged in 1763; crowds flocked to hear him. The late Dr. Bowen, of the Episcopal Church in New York, says that his father, who was a clergyman in the city in those days, told him that 'Mr. Gano possessed the best pulpit talents of any man that he ever heard.' Till 1763 this Church numbered only forty-one members, and two years before that it was scarcely known at all, although the little meeting-house had been built. Morgan Edwards came from Wales in 1761, and tells this pleasant anecdote:

"When I came to New York I landed in the morning and thought I would try if I could find any Baptists. I wandered up and down, looking at the place and the people, and wondering who of all the people I met might be Baptists. At length I saw an old man, with a red cap on his head, sitting in the porch of a respectable looking house. Ah, thought I, now this is one of the old inhabitants who knows all about the city; this is the man to inquire of. I approached him and said: "Good-morning, sir! Can you tell me where any Baptists live in this city?" "Baptists! Baptists!" said the old man, musing as if ransacking all the corners of his memory; "Baptists! I really don't know as I ever heard of any body of that occupation in these parts."

During the Revolutionary War the First Church was dispersed and its records suspended. No baptisms are recorded between that of Hannah Stillwell, April 28th, 1776, and that of Samuel Jones, afterward a deacon, on September 4th, 1784. The British forces occupied New York above seven years, during which time it was nearly ruined. No city in America was so long in the hands of the enemy and suffered so much. Its best inhabitants found shelter in other colonies, and the Tories made it their place of refuge. Pestilence and two great fires swept it, and the soldiery inflicted all the damage that they could. At the opening of the war there were nineteen churches in the city, but when it closed only nine of them could be used for worship. The Baptist meeting-house, having been used for a horse-stable, was almost in ruins. On his return to the city Gano found emptiness, desolation and ashes. The angels of God had not looked upon a more touching procession since that which united Calvary with Joseph's tomb, than that which solemnly moved into the wasted city from Harlem Heights. Washington and Clinton led it on horseback, followed by Knox with the remnant of the patriot army, some mounted and some on foot, with gaunt cheeks, weather-beaten, footsore and ragged, scarred and limping. Men who had left their bloody

foot-prints upon the sharp frozen snows of Valley Forge were there, with the man at their head who had shivered with them through the dreariest winter of the war; the man who had carried them to God in prayer, night and morning, when anguish sat heavily on his camp and his own soul was struggling through the darkest days of life. John Gano soon followed and says: 'We collected of our Church about thirty-seven members out of upward of two hundred, some being dead, and others scattered into almost every part of the Union.' But as soon as the sanctuary could be decently cleansed, he rallied his people and preached to them from Hag. 2:3: 'Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now?' Under his ministry the days of prosperity soon returned until he baptized his last convert April 5th, 1788, and left for Kentucky. During his pastorate he had baptized into the Church 297, and received 23 by letter. Amongst the first Regents of the University of New York we find the name of this heroic man, with this notice: 'Rev. John Gano, a clerical scholar of rare culture, pastor of the infant Baptist Church for sixteen years prior to the war; had been a chaplain in the army, and upon returning to the city with the establishment of peace, could find but thirty-seven out of his two hundred Church members.' His family raised a beautiful monument to his memory in Cincinnati. An altar-like pedestal bears an obelisk of much grace, with deep niches on each side. In every one of these there is an allegorical figure, while angels and rich wreaths of flowers adorn the various parts, the whole being crowned by an elaborate capital and a lambent urn. In the *basso-relievo* a shattered sepulcher is seen, from which a family has risen from the dead. Six years were spent in executing this delicate piece of workmanship.

Time fails to trace the remarkable history of this venerable Church through the striking ministry of Dr. Foster and William Colher to the close of the century. Shortly after Gano left, the question of singing disturbed them. The usage had prevailed of lining the verses of hymns sung, and now many wanted to sing from the books, whereupon fourteen persons, who wanted the hymns 'deaconed,' left and started the Second Baptist Church. 1790 this new Church got into a contention and divided, both parties claiming this name, but after a time they both dropped it, one taking the name of Bethel and the other of Fayette Street. The Bethel ceased to exist many years ago, but the Fayette Street had an illustrious history, first as the Oliver Street, and is now a noble body, known as the Baptist Church of the Epiphany, with Dr. Elder as pastor. Dr. Foster became pastor of the First Church in 1788, and before long some of the members, who could scent heresy from afar, discovered heterodoxy in his sermons. A serious disturbance followed, which resulted in the exclusion of thirteen persons in 1789. In 1790 twenty others took letters of dismissal and the Second Church received the excluded, which fact probably fermented their own contentions and led to their division.

The New York Baptist Association was formed in 1791, comprising the Scotch Plains, Oyster Bay, Morris-town, Connoe-Brook [Northfield], Staten Island, with the First and Second New York Churches. So rapidly and noiselessly did the leaven of our principles and practices spread that, by the close of the century, Churches were planted in seventeen counties of New York, extending from Sag Harbor to the New Jersey line, and from Staten Island to the Canada line. In 1794, according to Asplund, the churches numbered 84, the ministers 109, and the members 5,263.

The American Baptists

Chapter 10 - The Baptists of North Carolina, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont and Georgia

Still following the chronological order, we note the rise of Baptists in these several colonies. We have seen that individual Baptists from Virginia were found, in NORTH CAROLINA in the middle of the seventeenth century; but the Shiloh Church, formed by Paul Palmer in Camden County, on the Chowan River, in 1727, was the first Church founded in that colony. Palmer was from the Welsh Tract, in Delaware, and was a correspondent of John Comer, according to whose Journal this Church numbered thirty-two members in 1729. Joseph Parker, probably one of Palmer's converts, formed the second Church, at Meherrin, in 1729; but it was not until 1740 that the third was formed, at Sandy Run, by members dismissed from the Meherrin Church. Emigrants from Virginia, in company with William Sojourner, formed the fourth Church, in Halifax County, in 1742; and in 1752 these had increased to sixteen Churches, all being General Baptists.

They were not thoroughly spiritual Churches. They held to the scriptural authority of the ordinances of Baptism and the Supper, but some of them did not demand faith and conversion before receiving these, and they added to them, as of about equal authority, the rites of love-feasts, laying on of hands after baptism, washing of feet, anointing the sick, the right hand of fellowship, the kiss of charity, and the public devoting of children without christening, or what John Leland called 'dry christening.' This state of things existed when that region of country was visited by Robert Williams, of South Carolina; Benjamin Miller, Peter P. Vanhorn, and John Gano, of New Jersey; with Shubael Stearnes, of Virginia. Then God raised up a spiritual people who accepted the whole truth.

It is remarkable to see what a missionary spirit pervaded our American Churches from the

very first, especially put forth in practical efforts to take the Gospel into the new settlements. This subject is too interesting and vital to pass in silence, for the journey of a Baptist missionary meant the personal visitation of the scattered pioneers, who had gone to make homes for themselves in the wilderness. These men of God gathered the families in the region round about, preached to them, and frequently found members from the older settlements who, far away from the helps and restraints of Christian fellowship, had become careless about their religious life. The godless were led to Christ, the careless were reanimated by the missionary's earnest appeals, those who believed were baptized, frequently the whole community was moved religiously, and often a Baptist Church was organized. A second visit commonly resulted in the settlement of a pastor and the establishment of a branch Church in some adjacent neighborhood.

The South was particularly favored by such labors. Such men as William Tristoe, Abraham Marshall, Oliver Hort and Richard Furman caught much of the primitive, apostolic zeal and entered with all their powers into this work. An unknown correspondent of 'Rippon's Register' gives us a glimpse of such toils, in a letter of August 24th, 1790. He writes:

'In several counties of North Carolina I have preached to very numerous assemblies. At a "big meeting," as they call a convention, or when a stranger of any note visits them, it is seldom that the place of worship will contain half the congregation. If they have timely notice, hundreds think nothing of a distance of ten or twenty miles to meeting. Everyone has a horse, yes, even our poorest people have a horse to ride, and hence, when you arrive at the place appointed, you will see more horses tied all about the roads than can be seen at a fair in England, my native country. A stage, also, is erected, which you stand on to preach, and

The American Baptists

sometimes to two or three thousand hearers. I have preached, as was supposed, to three or four thousand. The meeting continues two or three days. There are frequently ten or a dozen ministers present, most of whom pray, preach, or exhort, as they find freedom. After the public service, those who live near the place of meeting, whether members or not, ask every person who comes from a distance to go home with them; and generally the greater the number who accept the invitation the better are they pleased, especially if a minister can be prevailed upon to be one of the guests. When you come to the house, they entertain you with the very best they have, both horses and men, and as soon as you have all dined, to preaching, praying, exhortation, etc. Near midnight you retire to rest; by sunrise in the morning, to prayers; then breakfast, and to public worship again, but not before your company is requested for the next night, if the meeting continues. This is the common practice in Georgia, South and North Carolina, in what we call the back part of the country. To a great many of these meetings I have been, and sometimes have seen a great deal of religion, and enjoyed the most solemn pleasures and comfortable opportunities I have ever had.'

The West and Northwest in those days meant Central and Western New York, but there, many of these inspiring features of large and enthusiastic meetings were lacking. The journeys were often long and perilous, attended with much hardship. Then, sometimes, these godly men were not welcomed, and they found it necessary to shake off the dust of their feet against American settlements as Christ's Apostles did against the towns of Palestine. The missionaries were generally volunteers, but sometimes the Associations commissioned them. Messengers from the South appealed to the Philadelphia Association, in 1754, for the labors of a missionary, and they sent John Gano, who traveled as far as Charleston, S.C. C.S. Todd, formerly the American Representative to Russia, draws this picture of Gano:

'He was, in person, below the middle stature, and when young, of a slender form, but of a firm, vigorous constitution, well fitted for performing active services with ease, and for suffering labors and privations with constancy...His presence was manly, open, and engaging. His voice strong and commanding, yet agreeable and capable of all those inflections which are suitable to express either the strong or tender emotions of an intelligent, feeling mind. In mental endowments and acquired abilities he appeared highly respectable; with clear conception and ready discernment, he formed readily a correct judgment of men and things. His acquaintance with the learned languages and sciences did not commence till he arrived at manhood, and was obtained chiefly by private instruction. To the refinement of learning he did not aspire; his chief object was such a competent acquaintance with its principles as would enable him to apply them with advantage to purposes of general usefulness in religion, and to the most important interests of society; and to this he attained.'

Thus endowed and armed, this holy man and his brethren of like spirit went to the Sandy Creek region in North Carolina. An Association was formed there in 1758 a monument to their fruitful labor, and by 1766 the Sandy Creek Church had aided in forming forty-two Churches. The Little River Church was another remarkable body. Formed in 1760, it increased to five hundred persons in three years and built five meeting-houses. These Churches had many contentions and alienations as Regulars and Separates for years; but these passed away when they became a thoroughly working people; they were too busy to quarrel, and now there is not a more efficient body of Baptists in the United States than those of South Carolina. Some of the mightiest names in our history have arisen in that State. Silas and Jesse Mercer, William T. Brantly, Basil Manly and a long line following, as Kerr and Howell, Poindexter and Mims, Brooks and Saunders, Emerson and Solomon, with a host of living men who would honor any

Chapter 10 - The Baptists of North Carolina, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont and Georgia

Christian community. As far back as 1793, Asplund reports that they had 112 churches, 172 ministers, and 8,017 communicants. But in 1886, they have 2,177 churches, 915 ministers, and 211,984 communicants.

MARYLAND. The question of religious liberty in this colony will be noticed in another place. For the present it is only needful to note that in 1649 the Assembly enacted:

'That no persons professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall be molested in respect of their religion, or the free exercise thereof, or be compelled to the belief or practice of any other religion, against their consent, so that they be not unfaithful to the proprietary, or conspire against the civil government. That persons molesting any other in respect of his religious tenets shall pay treble damages to the party aggrieved and twenty shillings to the proprietary. That the reproaching any with opprobrious epithets of religious distinctions shall forfeit ten shillings to the person aggrieved. That any one speaking reproachfully against the Blessed Virgin or the Apostles shall forfeit five pounds, but blasphemy against God shall be punished with death.'

When the first Baptist Church was founded in Maryland, it was a Roman Catholic colony, but our brethren were not persecuted in the proper sense of the term, although their protest against Rome was very strong. Henry Sator, an English General Baptist, appears to have formed the first Baptist Church in the colony, at Chestnut Ridge, near Baltimore, in 1742. Four years afterward it numbered 181 members, and, though feeble, it continues until this time. In 1754 it supplied members to form the Winter Run Church, in Harford County, and this, in turn, dismissed eleven members in 1785 to form the First Church in Baltimore. This last body has been greatly blessed, is now surrounded by many strong Churches, and has enjoyed the pastoral care of Dr. Williams for thirty-six years. The Waverly, Seventh and Leo Street Churches

are all offshoots from the First. The Seventh is the Church served so long and successfully by the late Dr. Richard Fuller before he formed the Eutaw Place Church. His successor in the Seventh Church was that lovely spirit, Dr. W.T. Brantly. From the first, Baptist growth has been very slow in Maryland. It contained only 17 churches, 13 ministers and 920 members in 1793; to-day it has 56 churches, 40 ministers, and 12,162 members. The Accomack Association of Virginia, however, was set off from the Salisbury in 1808.

There is no name which the Maryland Baptists more delight to honor than that of REV. RICHARD FULLER, D.D. He was born at Beaufort, S.G., April 22d, 1804, and was prepared to enter Harvard College by Rev. Dr. Brantly, but broken health compelled him to leave that institution when in his junior year. Able to return after an absence of five years, he was graduated in 1824 at the head of his class. He then studied law and rose to eminence in his profession. In 1831 he was converted at Beaufort, and says: 'My soul ran over with love and joy and praise; for days I could neither eat nor sleep.' He was baptized by Rev. H.O. Wyer, of Savannah, and united with the Baptist Church in his native place. He was soon chosen its pastor, was ordained in 1832 and labored in this field for fifteen years. When he left his lucrative law business to enter the ministry the Church was feeble, but under his faithful care it increased to about 200 white persons and 2,400 colored. His zeal was so great that he preached for weeks together in various parts of the South, and great numbers were brought to Christ. But in 1836 he was obliged to travel in Europe for his health. In 1847 he became pastor of the Seventh Baptist Church in Baltimore, a Church which numbered but 87 members at that time. Under his faithful toils it grew to the number of 1,200, and a body of its members retired with him to establish the new congregation, in which

he remained five years, and from which, after much suffering, he was called to his reward on high, on the 20th of October, 1876.

As a preacher Dr. Fuller was appreciated throughout the nation, for he found but one answer to the question, How can a man preach with power? He believed the word of God with all his soul and walked with its Author continually. His might lay where his heart was, in his holy breathings after the Holy Spirit. Richard Fuller would have retired from the pulpit in a moment, if the balancing query of skepticism had arisen in his mind as to whether the line of Divine Inspiration ran here or there through the Book of God. He rested with all his weight on the Bible as God's book, and came to his congregations not with every kind of light and idle speculation, but fresh with holy ardor from the footstool of that throne from which that word had been spoken. To this he added the most painstaking study to ascertain by every form of help what the Scriptures required him to preach. Aside from the dutiful visitation of the sick and sorrowful, and other indispensable duties, his mind was bent upon the divine results of the coming Sabbath. Superficial men, who are total strangers to the throbbings of soul-agony and the toilsome exertions of soul-thought, flippantly attributed his great power to the absence of half a quire of paper from his pulpit, and prated about his being an extempore preacher. But neither paper nor its absence ever made preachers of them, simply because they were flippant. Dr. Fuller's printed sermons bear the attestation of noon-tide and midnight to the industry of his pen. Each sermon witnesses that it had been curiously inwrought in the depth of his soul from Monday morning till Saturday night, and when it went with him into the pulpit it was a part of himself, whether the paper which contained its words went with him or stayed at home. Hence, no offensive froth, fustian, rant, or dilletanteism, found a home in his pulpit. There

he found nothing unworthy of his crucified Lord and the solicitude of perishing men, because he took nothing with him but the worthy.

He preached like a man of God, who had received from him a majestic personal presence, bordering on the imperial. He feared God enough to cultivate his voice and manner, framing their management on the best of rules and using them with consummate skill. Having a message from the Man of Calvary, he wished to deliver it as an accomplished pleader with men, for Jesus' sake. Believing that his body belonged to the crucified One, he gave himself no liberty to abuse it by injurious food, the use of degrading stimulants, or any other indulgence which showed that he despised the gift of God. He placed his great power of fancy, his vividness of perception, his methods of clear statement and his heart-pathos upon the altar of God's Lamb, and altogether the zeal of God's house consumed him. The writer once heard him when he showed himself to be a perfect master in the art of oratory, by denouncing the tricks of the orator in preaching. He wove one of the most fresh, vivid, and finished pieces of oratorical denunciation against dependence on pulpit oratorical effect, that man could put together. Under this spell he held his audience in breathlessness, and when they found a free breathing place men grew pale and nodded to their neighbors with a look which plainly said: 'What a horrible thing it is to be eloquent in the pulpit!' The Dr. did not intend to soar to the third heavens on the winds of inspired invective against pulpit eloquence, but he did, whether he intended it or not, and when we all returned to the earth with him, every man of us was ready to subscribe to the new litany: 'From false doctrine, heresy, and eloquence, good Lord deliver us!'

The Sator Church started with a keen zest against the Roman Catholic Communion. In what she called her 'solemn league and covenant,' her members bound themselves to

'abhor and oppose' 'Rome, Pope and popery, with all her antichristian ways,' which was all well enough, but it had been much better to have set up a strong defense against the grinding Antinomian and Anti-mission Pope, which divided and crippled the early Baptists of Maryland so sorely. A prairie fire does not desolate the plain worse than this blight crippled our people there at one time. In 1836 the Baltimore Association was rent asunder by this double curse. That year the Association met at Black Rock, and those who arrayed themselves against missionary movements, Sunday-schools, Bible and other benevolent societies, under the abominable pretense that they conflicted with the sovereignty of God in the kingdom of Christ, found themselves in a majority. They denounced these institutions as 'corruptions which were pouring in like a flood upon the Baptist Church,' and as 'cunningly devised fables.' Then they resolved that the Association could not hold fellowship with such Churches as united with such societies and encouraged others to do so, and dropped all these Churches from their minutes. Of course, the efforts of a few aggressive brethren were neutralized, and for a time all missionary work was suspended, lest the Churches should be doing the Lord's work instead of their own. Instead of being left free to spread the Gospel, the faithful minority found their hands full to resist this mad tide of ultra-Calvinism, and in a small degree its influence is felt there to this day. Yet, as if to illustrate the truth that extremes meet and embrace, it is true that some of the most wise and zealous advocates of missionary work amongst Baptists have sprung from the bosom of our Maryland Churches. Amongst them we find Noah Davis, the real founder of the Publication Society, and Benjamin Griffith, its great Secretary; William Crane, William Gary Crane, Bartholomew T. Welsh, Franklin Wilson, and the present Baptist leaders there generally, who love missionary

work as they love their lives. The very repression which they were obliged to oppose with all their might has only increased the intensity of these missionary advocates and supporters, and so the valiant little band of Baptists in Maryland are not a whit behind their sister Churches elsewhere in their sacrifices for Christ.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. Massachusetts claimed jurisdiction over New Hampshire in 1652, and it remained under that jurisdiction until 1679; but when the separation took place, New Hampshire retained the law which compelled all to support the Congregational Churches by public tax. The first unquestionable Baptist of that colony is found in the person of Rachel Scammon. Before her marriage she was a Miss Thurber, and lived at Rehoboth, Mass., but removed with her husband to Statham, N.H., in 1720. After entering her new home, she held to her Baptist convictions and frequently talked of them to her neighbors, but for forty years only one woman embraced her sentiments. This friend went to Boston and was immersed by Elder Bound, of the Second Church. Late in life Mrs. Scammon found Norcott's work on baptism, and went to Boston to get it printed for circulation, when the printer told her that he had one hundred copies on hand, which she bought and distributed in and around Stratham. She believed that a Baptist Church would arise in that place and her faith was honored, but not until after her death. Some years before this result of her faithfulness, independent influences were at work in the small town of Newtown, near Haverhill, Mass., which resulted in the establishment of a Baptist Church in that place, as the first in the colony. As in some other provinces, the preaching of George Whitefield had much to do with the origin of this inception of Baptist life. He had visited Ipswich, Newbury and Hampton in the autumn of 1740, and the Congregational Churches in that region were all astir, for the

Half-way Covenant was in danger.

In Boston, this Covenant had been a fire-brand from the first, and twenty-eight members having seceded in consequence of its adoption formed the Old South Church. Many of the Churches of the Standing Order went to such an extreme as to vote that: 'Those who wish to offer their children in baptism, join with the Church and have a right to all the ordinances and privileges of the Church.' Dr. Dexter puts the point clearly in these words: 'Starting with the theory that some germ of true faith, in the absence of proof to the contrary, must be assumed in a child of the covenant, sufficient to transmit a right of baptism to his children, but not sufficient to entitle him to partake of the Lord's Supper; not many years passed before the inference was reached that an amount of saving faith, even in the germ, which would justify the baptism of a man's children, ought to justify his own admission to the table of the Lord.' In keeping with this idea, Stoddard, of Northampton, wrote to prove that 'the Lord's Supper is instituted to be a means of regeneration,' and that men may and ought to receive it, 'though they knew themselves to be in a natural condition.' Of course, this state of things in the membership of the Churches was succeeded by an unconverted ministry. Right here Whitefield struck his first blow. In 1741 he describes his preaching in his *New England Journal*: 'I insisted much on the necessity of a new birth, as also on the necessity of a minister's being converted before he could preach aright. Unconverted ministers are the bane of the Christian Church. I think that great and good man, Mr. Stoddard, is much to be blamed for endeavoring to prove that unconverted men might be admitted to the ministry. A sermon lately published by Gilbert Tennent, entitled "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry" I think unanswerable.'

In this condition of things Whitefield's

preaching startled the community about Newtown, where Francis and Abner Chase were converted under his ministry. They desired to hold prayer-meetings in connection with the Congregational Church at West Amesbury, of which they were members. Their minister, Paino Wingate, opposed them in this, for he and the neighboring ministers had signed a remonstrance, dated December 26th, 1744, against the admission of Whitefield into their pulpits. As the Chases could not enjoy the ministry of one whom they thought unconverted, they left his ministry and held prayer-meetings in their own houses. The records of the Amesbury Church [West Parish] show, that from 1747 to 1749 Francis Chase was under discipline in that Church 'for greatly neglecting the public worship of God.' A committee of the same body also visited Mr. Abner Chase in 1749 for 'absenting himself from public worship.' The reason that he gave for doing so was: 'A discord or contention that then was between the Church or parish and Mr. Wingate, as also the Church meeting [treated] Francis Chase, as he thought, unhandsomely.' Worth says that Mary Morse, of West Newbury, 'after Mrs. Abner Chase, experienced religion when about seven years of age, and was baptized when about sixteen, Mr. Francis Chase, of Newton, a member of the Congregational Church in Amesbury, was baptized two or three weeks previous. These are supposed to have been the first persons ever baptized in the Merrimack, which was probably in 1750. It is believed that the administrator was Rev. Mr. Hovey, who was afterward settled at Newton.' These and some of the following facts are taken from the discourse preached before the New Hampshire Baptist Convention, October, 1876, by Rev. W.H. Eaton, D.D., of Keene, who says in a private note: 'In the fall and winter of 1871-2 I spent six months in Newton, N.H., preaching to the little Church there and spending much time in searching old papers in families

Chapter 10 - The Baptists of North Carolina, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont and Georgia

that descended from the earliest settlers, also the records of neighboring Churches.'

There is no doubt that the Newtown [now Newton] Church was the first of the Baptist order founded in New Hampshire, but there is a dispute as to whether it was organized in 1750 or 1755. Backus and others have fixed upon the last of these dates. But there is an old manuscript preserved amongst his unpublished papers, which appears to throw light upon this point, written by Francis Chase, who was one of the constituent members of the Church, for some years its clerk, and toward the close of life a deacon in the First Church at Haverhill. Chase writes: 'A brief account of the first incorporation of the First Baptist Church and Society in Newtown, N.H., in the year 1750, January 10th. We increased in number till the year 1755. In June 28th Elder Powers was ordained our pastor.' Dr. Eaton says that he submitted this document to Dr. Weston, the late editor of Backus's History, who gave the opinion as most probable: That the history of the Church in Newton is analogous to that of the Church in Bellingham; that it was formed January 10th, 1750, was weak and had no stated preaching till 1755, when it had become strong enough to settle a pastor and let its existence be known; that Backus, as in the case of the Bellingham Church, gives the date of its revival as that of its constitution, but that its seal as given by the first clerk in his sketch is 1750.' Chase's direct statement, with all the collateral evidence, renders this the most likely. No records of this Church are found earlier than October 7th, 1767, when the minutes of a meeting occur, but they reveal its severe struggle for existence. Two of its members were in the firm grip of the law, and the Church resolved that if one member suffered all would suffer with him. It was therefore 'voted' thus:

1. To carry on Mr. Steward's and Mr.

Carter's law-suits, which are now in the law on account of rates imposed on them by the Standing Order.

2. To give Mr. Hovey for the year ensuing for his labors with us fifty pounds lawful money in such things as he wants to live on.

3. That Andrew Whittier, John Wadleigh, and Joseph Welsh be chosen to say what each man's part shall be of what we promised to give Mr. Hovey.

4. That these men shall take the province rate for their rate, and do it as light as they can.

5. That these men are to abate such men as they think are not able to pay their parts with the rest.

6. That those who will not pay their equal proportion according as these men shall tax them, their punishment is this, that they shall have no help from us to clear them from paying rates other where.'

It is as refreshing as a breeze from their own mountains to find so much human 'granite' in this little band of New Hampshire Baptists. They refuse to support a State Church by force, and they resolve to support their own chosen pastor cheerfully. This suit continued for three years, and must have been very vexatious, for at a 'meeting legally named, holden at the Antipedo-Baptist meeting-house,' they resolved to 'proportion the whole costs of these suits; to examine the account and settle what is honest and right.' Such a Church deserved to live, and it exists today.

At Stratham a young physician, Dr. Shepard, a member of the Congregational Church, chanced to be visiting a patient, and taking up Norcott's book he carefully read it, became a Baptist and one of the fathers of the denomination. Soon a Church was established in that place, and, becoming a minister, he was a burning and shining light to the whole colony. The Churches at Madbury and Weare appear to have been formed in 1768, but it was not till 1770-71 that our churches began to multiply

rapidly, when we have Brentwood in 1771, Gilmanton in 1772, and a number of others by 1780. The itineracy of Whitefield and others had stimulated several men of God to visit many destitute places. Amongst the most prominent of these was Dr. Hezekiah Smith, of Massachusetts, an able preacher, full of zeal. He visited Concord in 1771 and preached there with great power. But the Standing Order resented his presence as a daring impertinence which threatened the peace of the town, and, in the absence of newspapers; Parson Walker advertised him extensively by thundering at him from the pulpit, as much exasperated as a farmer could well be to find strange cattle in his cornfield. In the same year Dr. Smith preached at Nottingham, Brentwood and Stratham, and baptized thirty eight persons, amongst whom were Dr. Shepard and Rev. Eliphalet Smith, the pastor of a Congregational Church. In Deerfield many were baptized, amongst them Joshua Smith, who afterwards became an evangelist of great power. Thirteen others were baptized with Pastor E. Smith, and on the same day were organized into a Baptist Church at Deerfield. The Brentwood Church was formed in 1771, and soon spread out into twelve branch Churches, which in 1793 numbered 443 members, with Dr. Samuel Shepard for their pastor.

Eight persons from Killingworth, Conn., in 1766, and another band from Worcester County, Mass., in 1780, settled at Newport, near Croydon. Most of them were Baptists, and their settlement was soon known as 'Baptist Hill.' The religious destitution of that region of New Hampshire was soon made known to the Warren Association, which sent Messrs. Jacobs, Ledoyt, Seamans and Ransom as missionaries. Ledoyt and Seamans followed the Connecticut River as far as Woodstock, preaching mainly on the New Hampshire side, but also on the Vermont side of that stream. A Church of eight members was organized at Baptist Hill in May, 1778, called

the First Church of Newport and Croydon, but was soon after known as the Newport Baptist Church. Biel Ledoyt became pastor of this body in 1791, and in 1795 it numbered eighty-nine members. Seamans established a Church in New London, of which he was pastor, which numbered about one hundred members at the close of the century. For years the Newport Church worshiped in a barn by the side of the river, which became noted chiefly because Thomas Baldwin the Good, afterwards of Boston, preached a most memorable sermon there. At that time he was the pastor at Canaan, in New Hampshire. On this great occasion the Assembly was so charmed that it was reluctant to leave, and the meeting continued to a late hour in the night, but Mr. Baldwin was obliged to return to meet an engagement at home in the morning. He mounted his horse, picked his way through the almost trackless forest as best he could by the light of the stars, and as he mused over the precious meeting in the barn his heart burned, and he began to sing. The words which sprang to his lips were those of his union hymn, which have since been sung all over the continent:

'From whence doth this union arise,
That hatred is conquered by love.'

Those who love that hymn may be glad to know that it was born at midnight in the New Hampshire wilderness, while its author was alone with God, after preaching to his despised Baptist brethren in a barn. This Church built their first meeting-house in 1798, a building forty feet square, which Dr. Baron Stow describes in 1810. He says:

'I am in that plain edifice, with a superabundance of windows, and a porch at each end; with its elevated pulpit, sky-blue in color, overhung by a sounding-board; with the deacon's seat half-way up the pulpit; with the square pews occupied by families; with a

Chapter 10 - The Baptists of North Carolina, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont and Georgia

gallery containing one row of pews fronted by the singers' seats. There is the horse-shed, there is the horse-block; there are the horses with men's saddles and pillions, and a few women's saddles, but not a carriage of any description. On occasions of baptism the whole congregation would go down the hill, and, standing in a deep glen on the banks of Sugar River, would witness the ceremonies. Ehas McGregor played the bass-viol, Asa, a brother, led the choir, and his sisters, Lucy and Lois, sang soprano and alto. In the choir were Asaph Stowe, Moses Paine Durkee, Philip W. Kibbey, and more than one of the Wakefields.'

It was in this church that Baron Stow was converted and baptized, and from it he went to the Academy at Newport and the Columbian College, Washington, whence he graduated and was ordained pastor of the Church at Portsmouth, N.H. where he served five years before he removed to spend his wonderful life in Boston. He was succeeded at Portsmouth by the late Duncan Danbar, of New York. In 1820 the Newport Church introduced the system of supporting itself by assessing a tax upon its members, 'in proportion to the invoice of each member of the society, as taken by the selectmen.' For years this self-imposed tax wrought only contention and it was abandoned. This body was in the Woodstock Association till 1828, when the Newport Association was formed, which has frequently enjoyed the hospitality of the old Church. When the Woodstock Association met with it in 1826, a committee of four was appointed 'to distribute cake, cheese and cider to the members of the Association during the session.'

These were the beginnings of Baptist history in New Hampshire, from which powerful Churches and able ministers of the New Testament sprang in every direction. Our people have now increased to six Associations, eighty Churches, and 8,851 communicants. In consequence of the severity of the New Hampshire climate and the limited area of its

territory, this State has sent forth a large and valuable population to all the new States and Territories, especially to California, which immigration accounts in part for its small Baptist statistics. And a second reason for this is found in the fact that in 1780 Rev. Benjamin Randall, a Baptist preacher of ability and influence, established the Free-Will Baptist denomination, which absorbed a number of our Churches and became a strong body in the State. The Free Baptists differ from the old body chiefly in rejecting Calvinistic doctrine and the practice of strict communion.

The list of noble ministers which New Hampshire has given to our Churches in addition to those already named is very marked. It includes Alonzo King, the biographer of George Dana Boardman, Enoch and Elijah Hutchinson, and John Learned. Thomas Baldwin served the Church at Caanan for seven years, during which time he planted other Churches at Grafton, Hebron and Groton. In later years, one of the most noted men of the State was found in Dr. E.E. Cummings. He was one of the most faithful of men to his trusts. Born in Claremont, N.H. November 9th, 1800, he joined the Baptist Church there in 1821, graduated at Waterville College in 1828, and was that year ordained pastor of the Church in Salisbury. He became pastor of the First Church, Concord, in 1832, and remained there till 1854, when he took the pastorate of the Pleasant Street Church. After serving these two Churches for thirty-three years, he spoilt the last years of his life as a missionary in the State at large, dying February 22d, 1886. It is said that he left a manuscript on the history of our ministry for the first hundred years of its existence in New Hampshire, which certainly than be given to the world.

VERMONT. The Great Awakening, or New Light revival, had swept over Vermont quite as powerfully as it had over New Hampshire, or even more so, possibly because it was nearer the

The American Baptists

scene of the sternest Conflict. Jonathan Edwards had succeeded his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, as pastor at Northampton, and had attempted to close the door of Church membership against the unconverted, when that Church, wedded to the Half-way Covenant, dismissed him, and he was obliged to go into the wilderness to preach the Gospel to the Housatonic Indians. There, though broken in health, the great metaphysician and theologian spent six years in coming nearer and nearer to the truth on all that related to the anti-sacramentarian doctrine and a regenerated Church, until on these points he stood side by side with the Baptists. His doctrine spread rapidly through Vermont; but nowhere did it take firmer hold than in the town of Shaftsbury. In 1768, the first Baptist Church of Vermont sprang from the movement in that town, chiefly under the leadership of Bliss Willoughby, the pastor of a Separatist Church, who went a step further than Edwards in the proper observance of Gospel ordinances, and became a Baptist in 1764. Three other Churches went out from this Church, in the same town, within the ensuing ten years; after which came a number of other Churches in quick succession; amongst them that at Pownal in 1773, at Woodstock in 1779, those at Guilford, Dummerston and many others, numbering 41 Churches in 1793, with 40 ministers and 2,221 members.

As these interests increased Baptist ministers were sent for from other parts of New England, and some removed to Vermont for permanent residence. More than a score are mentioned by name, amongst them Ransom and Ledoyt, Elisha Ransom becoming pastor at Woodstock in 1780. As in the rest of New England, the Vermont Baptists paid a great price for their liberty; everywhere having to fight the old battle with the Standing Order. Ransom, under date of March 23d, 1795, writes of a member of Elder Drew's Church at Hartford, Vt., who was sent to

jail for refusing to pay the State Church rates, yet was obliged to pay them. He contested the case with the authorities at a cost of more than £50, but in each trial the decision was against him. Ransom says that five petitions with more than two hundred signatures were sent up to the Assembly asking for redress; then he adds:

'I went to speak for them; and after my averment that the certificate law was contrary to the rights of man, of conscience, the first, third, fourth and seventh articles of our Constitution, and to itself, for it took away our rights and then offered to sell them back to us for a certificate, some stretched their mouths, and though no man contradicted me in one argument, yet they would shut their eyes, and say that they could not see it so. I had many great friends in the house, but not a majority.'

The Baptists of Vermont have been characterized by both ministers and laymen of signal ability. Some of our first educators have sprung from their ranks, for they have always been distinguished for their love of learning. Amongst these we have the late Irah Chase and Daniel Hascall, 'Rev. Drs. A.C. Kendrick and T. J. Conant. Laymen of note are found in Hon. Jonas Galusha, at one time Governor of Vermont; Hon. Ezra Butler, also Governor of the State, and Hon. Aaron Leland, Lieutenant-Governor; yet each of these preached the Gospel. Ephraim Sawyer and John Conant (though born in Massachusetts) were men of renown, the former as a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and the latter as a justice of the peace and a member of the Vermont Legislature for many years. But our denomination has never been strong in that State. Like New Hampshire, its people have removed West with the great tide of emigration, especially to western New York, in earlier times, and then markedly to Ohio and the still newer States. At present we have 7 Associations in Vermont, 116 churches, 104 ministers and 8,880

members. It may be well here to note the excitement which existed in many of the Vermont Baptist Churches in the year 1843, on the question of our Lord's second advent. Deacon William Miller lived near Pouitney, a man of strong but uncultivated mind, who devoted most of his time to the study of the prophecies and Rollin's 'Ancient History,' making this and other such works an index to the interpretation of prophecy. Having created for himself a system of interpretations, by a method peculiarly his own, he believed that he had demonstrated that Christ would come on or about February 15th 1843. He exerted large influence on all who knew him, from his many excellencies and spotless character. He had been a captain in the War of 1812 and fought valiantly at the battle of Plattsburg; he was also a civil magistrate in his own town. In person he was large and heavily built, his head broad and his brow high, with a soft and expressive eye, and all the inflections of his voice indicated the sincerest devotion. His imagination was quite fervid, and having drawn his conclusion from a defective premise it became to him a real fact. In this state of mind he went about lecturing, using large charts illustrative of the visions of Daniel and John. Immense throngs came to hear him, a number of ministers and laymen of large mind embraced his views, and the greatest excitement prevailed over the eastern and northern parts of our country. Many Churches, especially amongst Baptists, Methodists and Congregationalists, were seriously disturbed by the controversy and some were rent to pieces. The press teemed with discourses and pamphlets on the subject, many of them absurd enough on both sides. Much ill-feeling also sprang up as is usual in such cases, and both sides arrogated to themselves a tone of plenary infallibility in the interpretation of disputed passages. The controversy surged for months around the passage, 'Of that, day and hour knoweth no

man,' the anti-Adventists taking the sage ground that as they did not know that he would come, therefore he would not; and the Adventists replying, that because they did not know that he would not come, therefore he surely would. What made the excitement the more furious was the sudden rush of an enormous comet upon the heavens, unannounced, early in January, which blazed for weeks, until its sword-like train divided into two blades. Then came a heavy fall of red snow, such as is often found in the Arctic regions and the Alps; and although Professor Agassiz had demonstrated, three years before, that this tinge was occasioned by the presence of animalcules in the flakes, it made no difference in the interpretation of the phenomenon, which was to the effect, that they were supernaturally impregnated with some gelatinous and chemical element, which was simply fuel for burning up the earth. The craze went so far that many made white ascension robes and stood shivering in the snow on the nights of February 14th and 15th, expecting to be caught up into the air, and meetings were held in hundreds of places of worship during those nights, while many sold all that they had and proved their sincerity by giving the money to the sick and suffering. The writer had much conversation with Mr. Miller, and has in his possession a number of books bought from the library of the late Rev. George Storrs, one of the leading advocates of Mr. Miller's doctrine, who so used his money. The same order of delusion has appeared in the earth several times during the ages, and is sure to occur again, judging from present appearances.

GEORGIA. Governor Oglethorp settled this colony in 1733, and at least two Baptists, Messrs. Campbell and Dunham, came over in the ship with him; others soon followed, amongst them Mr. Polhill. When Whitefield came, in 1751, Nicholas Bedgewood accompanied him to take charge of the Orphan House, which was soon erected near Savannah.

The American Baptists

This young man had a classical education and was a fine speaker. Five years after his arrival he was baptized by Rev. Oliver Hart, pastor of the Baptist Church at Charleston, and two years later, he was ordained, and baptized Benjamin Stirk and several other converts at the Orphan House, where many suppose that a branch Church to that at Charleston was formed; in his turn, he became a minister in 1767, preaching in his own house at Kewington above Savannah, and formed a branch Church to that at Eutaw, S.C. Edmund Botsford came from England in 1771, was converted in the Charleston Church, and went as a missionary into Georgia. Daniel Marshal also removed from South Carolina into Georgia in 1771; and Botsford falling in with Colonel Barnard, at Augusta, introduced him to Marshall at Kiokee, where he had formed the first Baptist Church proper in the colony, in 1772. Botsford was then but a licentiate, and his meeting with this veteran was very interesting. Marshall said:

'Well, sir, you are to preach for us.'

'Yes, sir, by your leave,' Botsford replied, 'but I am at a loss for a text.'

'Look to the Lord for one,' was Marshall's answer.

He preached from the words, 'Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what he has done for my soul.' Marshall was greatly blessed under the sermon, and at its close said: 'I can take thee by the hand and call thee brother, for somehow I never heard conversion better explained in my life; but I would not have thee think thou preachest as well as Joe Reese and Philip Mulkey; however, I hope thee will go home with me.' He did, and they were like David and Jonathan to each other to the close of life.

Botsford's ministry was greatly honored of God, and he organized several Churches, amongst them the second in Georgia, called the Botsford Church, near Augusta, in 1773. Other

Churches were soon formed, for in 1784 the Georgia Association was organized by five Churches, which number increased so rapidly that in 1793 there were in Georgia sixty-one Churches, with 3,227 communicants. Baptist interests were established too late in this colony to subject our brethren there to the persecutions which they endured in many of the older colonies. Yet, on January 11th, 1758, the General Assembly, meeting at Savannah, passed a law making the Church of England the Church of the province. It established two parishes, 'Christ's Church,' at Savannah, and 'St. Paul's,' at Augusta, and provided for their support by public tax, also for the establishment of other parishes in due time. Under this law Daniel Marshall was arrested one Sabbath 'for preaching in the parish of St. Paul' contrary to the 'rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.' His congregation was assembled in a beautiful grove, under the blue sky, and he was on his knees making the opening prayer, when a hand was laid on his shoulder and a voice interrupted him saying: 'You are my prisoner!' He was then sixty-five years of age and his hair was white as snow. The man of God arose and gave security to appear for trial the next day at Augusta, and the constable, Samuel Cartledge, released him, without a word of remonstrance or rebuke from the venerable preacher.

But Mrs. Martha Marshall, a woman of a most powerful mind, and, as she demonstrated on several occasions, of remarkable eloquence, not only remonstrated stoutly, but with all the solemnity of a prophetess exhorted Cartledge to flee from the wrath to come and be saved from his sins. Dr. J.H. Campbell says that the man was so moved that he did repent and seek his salvation, that Marshall baptized him in 1777, when he first became a deacon in the Church at Kiokee, and in 1789 he was ordained a minister. He was little more than twenty-one when he was converted and preached the Gospel for half a

century, dying in 1843 at the age of ninety-three years. The early history of the Georgia Baptists was marked by many extensive revivals of religion, sometimes adding many thousands to their Churches in a year, as in 1812-13, 1820 and in 1827, when between 15,000 and 20,000 persons were added to them. This great revival was largely promoted by the labors of Adiel Sherwood, D.D., who seemed to be endued with power from heaven. He was pastor at that time of the Churches at Milledgeville, Greeneborough, and Eatonton, at the last of which places he taught in an academy. One Sabbath in September he was preaching in the open air, before the Ocmulgee Association, at Antioch Church, in Morgan County, when the power of God fell upon the people in the most wonderful manner. At the close of his sermon he asked all who wished for the prayers of the assembly to present themselves. The first one to accept the invitation was one of the most accomplished young gentlemen in Georgia, in all that relates to grace of person, courteous manners, breadth of mind and natural eloquence. This was Dr. John E. Dawson, who afterwards became one of the most brilliant and pathetic preachers in the South. It is estimated that 4,000 persons followed him that day in asking the prayers of the congregation, and within two years about 16,000 people, according to Dr. Sherwood's private memoranda, were added to the Churches, as the fruit of that meeting more or less directly.

Dr. Sherwood was one of the most godly men in America. He was born at Fort Edward, N.Y., in 1791, and was the son of a Revolutionary soldier, a firm personal friend of General Washington. In 1817 Adiel graduated at Union College, and then passed a year at the Andover Theological Seminary, when, his health becoming somewhat impaired, he went to Georgia. He was ordained to the work of the ministry in that State, and in 1828 he preached

333 sermons in forty counties, with astonishing success. After filling many places of trust, he became the Professor of Sacred Literature in Marshall College and finally its President. In person he was large and dignified, very vehement in manner, though tender in spirit, possessing a prudent and executive mind; thoughtful and learned, he stood in the front ranks as a speaker and writer. Georgia owes much to him for its pre-eminence as a Baptist State, especially in that zeal and intelligence which have made our Churches and ministry so strong within its bounds. No one else has exerted so wide and healthy an influence in advancing our cause there excepting his true yoke-fellow, Rev. Jesse Mercer, whose apostolic wisdom, zeal and spirituality have rendered him immortal. And yet, a noble army of godly men have filled their places and each done an order of work which none other could have done. This is equally true of the living and the dead. Amongst the laymen we have had Governors Rabun and Lumpkin, with the Reeveses, Wellborns and Stocks, statesmen and jurists of the first class; and the names of her ministers are held in universal reverence, as, the two Marshalls, the two Mercers, with Holcomb, Saunders, Clay, Johnson, Binney, Crawford and Dagg. From the first our brethren there have been Calvinistic in their doctrines, strict in their communion, as well as the firm friends of educational and missionary work. Taking all things into the account, the Georgia Baptists have been characterized, and still are, for their mental vigor, their extraordinary knowledge of human nature, their deep convictions of Gospel truth, and an overpowering native eloquence in winning men to Christ.

Hon. Joseph E. Brown, United States Senator from Georgia, has long been one of the leading Baptists of that State. He was born in South Carolina April 5th, 1821, but while young his father removed to Georgia. He enjoyed no

educational advantages until he was nineteen years of age, when he determined to leave his father's farm to procure a collegiate education. His mother made him a suit of homespun clothes, his father gave him a pair of young oxen for his patrimony, and he started on a nine days' journey to the Calhoun Academy in South Carolina. A farmer agreed to give him eight months' board in payment for his oxen, Wesley Leverett, the principal of the school, promised his tuition on credit, and so the young hero began life. He made rapid progress with his studies, and at the end of the eight months he taught school. Having earned money enough to pay his instructor, he returned to the academy and began a new credit both for tuition and board. In two years he was ready to enter an advanced class in college, but was obliged to forego that high privilege, to teach school in Canton, Ga. While again earning money to pay his debts he became a private tutor in the family of Dr. Lewis, at Canton, and gave his spare time to the study of law. In 1845 he was admitted to the bar, after a searching examination; but not satisfied with this, by the aid of the doctor he entered the law school at Yale College, where, in 1846, he was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Laws, when he returned to Georgia and rapidly rose in his profession. He was elected to the Senate of Georgia in 1849, Judge of the Superior Court in 1855, and Governor of the State in 1857. He served in this high office for four terms, being re-elected the last time in 1863. In 1869 he was appointed Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia for the term of twelve years, but resigned his office after filling it with much ability for two years, when he accepted the presidency of the Western and Atlantic Railroad Company. He was appointed by Governor Colquitt, in 1880, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of General Gordon in the United States Senate. Since, he has been elected to the Senate, the last

time with but one vote against him.

While at Calhoun Academy, and when but twenty-two years of age, he was baptized, on the profession of his faith, by Elder C. P. Dean, and has been marked for his devotion to the cause of Christ ever since, he is a man of well balanced and strong mind, but of few words. His understanding is clear, his temper calm, his will firm, and he possesses that sagacious, matter-of-fact common sense which never fails him in time of trial. Withal, being blessed with large wealth and a benevolent heart, his liberality is widely felt in supporting charitable, educational and religious plans. When the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was passing through its most trying days, he quietly gave it \$50,000 and infused new life into its endowment. This act could not fail to reach the public ear, though he was unostentatious in his gift. Senator Brown is a, trustee of the University of Georgia; and foremost in all the important movements of the Baptist denomination in that State.

The Georgia Baptists of early times firmly withstood all the aggressions of the State upon the Church until they secured their religious liberties. On the one hand they could not be forced to pay a tax for the State Church, and on the other, they could not be cajoled into the acceptance of State money for the support of their own Churches. On the 21st of February, 1785, an Act was passed by the Legislature for the support of religion, which provided that 'thirty heads of families' in any community might choose a minister 'to explain and inculcate the duties of religion,' and 'four pence on every hundred pounds valuation of property' should be taken out of the public tax for the support of such minister. The Baptists formed a large majority in many parts of the State, and could have chosen many ministers under this Act, but instead of doing so, they united in a remonstrance to the Legislature in the following May, and sent it by the hands of Silas Mercer

and Peter Smith, insisting that the obnoxious law should be repealed, on the ground that the State had nothing to do with the support of religion by public tax, and it was repealed. (Pub. Bees. of Ga. MS. vol. B., p. 284, Marshall Papers.) Yet as late as 1863 they found it necessary to fight another battle on that subject. The New Code of Georgia provided, in Section 1376, that 'it shall be unlawful for any Church, society or other body, or any persons, to grant any license or other authority to any slave or free person of color to preach, or exhort, or otherwise officiate in Church matters.' This aroused the Baptists of the State, and a very powerful paper, drawn by Dr. H.H. Tucker, and largely signed by his brethren, was sent in remonstrance and protest to the Legislature, demanding the repeal of this iniquitous provision. They denounced it 'as a seizure by force of the things that are God's, and a rendering them unto Caesar,' an 'usurpation of ecclesiastical power by civil authorities.' They resisted it as a trespass upon the rights of conscience and a violation of religious liberty. They claimed that 'it is the sacred right of the black to preach, exhort or pray, if God has called and commanded him to do either.' They protested that it was an offense against 100,000 Baptist communicants in the State, and that the Baptist Church in Columbia, 'with the new Code spread open before their eyes, and with a full knowledge and understanding of the intent and meaning of Section 1376, and after a thorough discussion of its provisions, deliberately violated the same, and ordained two negroes to officiate in Church matters in the office of deacon.' They claim that the obnoxious law 'trespasses not only on the rights of men but on the rights of God. It dictates to the Almighty what color his preachers shall be...and says to Omnipotence: "Thus far shalt Thou go and no farther." It allows Jehovah to have ministers of a certain complexion, and so exacting and rigid are these

regulations imposed on the Almighty that they not only forbid his having preachers such as he may choose, but also prescribe that none shall even exhort, or in any way whatever officiate in Church matters, unless they be approved by this self-exalted and heaven-defying tribunal. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the spirit which prompted the act now under protest would stop, if unchecked, at its present point of audacity. Having prescribed color as one qualification for the pulpit, it might prescribe another qualification to-morrow.' The obnoxious section was repealed, and the State no longer imposes restrictions on the freedom of the Churches.

The contests which the Georgia Baptists pushed against all that is narrow in ignorance and bigotry, especially from 1827 to 1840, in the shape of Anti-effort, has made the entire denomination their debtors. As in Maryland, the old school, or Primitive Baptists, as they loved to call themselves, arose in great strength, dividing Churches and rending Associations with great bitterness. This Antinomian element assailed their brethren with bitter satire, an element not known in the New Testament. One of the periodicals of the times published a sermon intended to caricature their missionary brethren who were spending their lives in beseeching men to be reconciled to God. Its text was taken from Prov. 27:27: 'Thou shalt have goats milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household, and for the maintenance of thy maidens.' The preacher said that those who raised money for missions were first milking the sheep of Christ's flock; then turning to the non-professing goats, they obtained goat's milk enough for their editors, agents and secretaries, who were the maidens of the household, and so the poor drained goats fattened a few sinecures. Hard pushed with such trash, they brought ridicule upon our Lord's commission to 'go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.' Our brethren had the wisdom and

The American Baptists

firmness to resist this blight most steadfastly; one result of which is seen in the fact that now the laborious and aggressive Baptists are left nearly alone in the field. Their success has been astonishing, so that today they have the largest Baptist population of any State in the Union. They have 102 Associations, 1,601 ministers,

2,623 Churches, and 261,314 members. Yearly half the Baptists of Georgia are colored people, who in latter years have been greatly aided by forming separate Churches and Associations of their own, and the present prospect, both of the white and colored Baptists, is more bright and prosperous than ever before.

Chapter 11 - Baptists and the Revolutionary War

As time is the only reliable interpreter of prophecy, so history best traces the hand of God in preparing men for great events. It was impossible for the Baptists of the colonies to understand why they endured so much for their principles and secured so little in return, from the settlement of New England to the time of the Revolution. The Declaration of Independence was made July 4th, 1776, and the nation's struggle for liberty lasted about seven years. As nearly as we can get at the figures, there were but 97 Baptist Churches in all the colonies in 1770, and many of these were so very small, that one pastor, where they had pastors, supplied several of them lying many miles apart and preached to them only at long intervals of time, while others were dependent entirely on occasional visits from itinerant preachers. There was a large increase of Churches during the war, although many Churches were scattered, but in 1784 our total membership in the thirteen colonies was only about 35,000, although one hundred and forty-five years had passed since the Church at Providence was constituted, and one hundred and nineteen years since the Church at Boston was gathered. Where they had houses of worship they were of the commonest character, and the most of their ministers received no salary. So common was it for the Churches to content themselves with one sermon a month, that these came to be known as 'Thirty-day Baptists,' and so ignorant or mean, or both, were many of them, that they thought it the absolute duty of their pastors to support themselves by a profession, by farming, or some other form of manual labor, and then prove their Apostolic calling by preaching for nothing. This class of Baptists took the greatest possible comfort in the thought that while the 'starched gentry' of the Standing Order peeled them by taxation, their pastors were strangers to

'filthy lucre.'

Under these conditions our ministry could not be eminent for learning. When Manning established his preparatory school at Warren, he and Hezekiah Smith, who had studied with him at Princeton, together with Jeremiah Condy and Edward Upham, graduates of Harvard, were the only liberally educated Baptist pastors in New England. Some who subsequently became known as scholars had studied with Isaac Eaton, at Hopewell. In addition to the above named, Dr. Guild mentions Samuel Jones and a number more who were students at that academy, and also in that opened at Lower Dublin in 1776. Several years later, William E. Williams, one of the first graduates of Rhode Island College, was added to the list of the educated, and opened an academy at Wrentham, Mass. Things existed much after the same order in the Middle and Southern Colonies, for down to that time the chief education of our ministry had consisted in that moral strength and fortitude which hardship and severity inspire. God, who foresaw the times which were to try men's souls, was clearly educating one class of his people to meet the high destiny for which only scourging, bonds and imprisonments can discipline men. Brown University had begun its work, and the Denomination was feeling after its future; but for the then present necessity, what our ministry lacked in the work of the schools, when compared with their Congregational brethren, was marked by a like disparity in favor of the Baptists in consecration to the saving of men. Their doctrine, that none but the regenerate should enter the Church of Christ, inspired that effort to bring men to repentance which could not spring from faith in birthright membership. The social and political forces combined against them only contributed to maintain their zeal and devotion. To falter in maintaining the

truth was to be crushed out of existence.

Besides, nothing but aggressive work could keep them alive to their peculiar views of religious liberty. Others were moved to resist the aggressions of Britain, simply on the ground that they were the victims of political oppression. This the Baptists felt also, but their circumstances impelled them to seek a higher order of liberty than that sought by their fellow-citizens. Whatever oppressions England inflicted upon the colonies she seldom deprived them of their religious liberties, but from the first left them to manage these alone. Excepting in Virginia, the colonies, and not the mother government, laid the heavy yoke of religious oppression upon the Baptist neck. On several occasions they had appealed to the crown and their religious grievances had been redressed, as against their colonial oppressors. Hence, in the Revolution they were to fight a double battle; one with their political enemies on the other side of the sea, and the other with their religious tyrants on this side. The colonies were not about to begin a revolution for religious liberty; that they had; but the Baptists demanded both, and this accounts for the desperation with which they threw themselves into the struggle, so that we have no record of so much as one thorough Baptist tory.

Down to the Revolution, all the colonies, with the exception of Rhode Island, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, had a Church established either by law or custom as the rightful controller of the spiritual interests of the people, and those of Massachusetts and Virginia, were peculiarly intolerant. In these the influence of the Baptists, as the champions of religious equality, was especially felt, as they resisted the legislative, judicial and executive departments combined. They were emboldened in this resistance from the fact that they took and held a footing despite this combination against them, and by piece-meal wrenched from their foes the

recognition of their rights. In 1753 a law was passed in Massachusetts exempting Baptists from taxation to support the Standing Order, on condition that they confessed and proved themselves 'Anabaptists,' by certificates from three such Churches. Meetings were called in Boston, Medfield and Bellingham, to devise methods of relief from this offensive act. John Proctor, a public-school teacher of Boston, and one of the original members of the Second Baptist Church there, was appointed to carry the case to England. He also drew up a remonstrance to the Legislature claiming that, under the charter of William and Mary, the Baptists had as good, ample and extensive a right to think and act for themselves in matters of a religious nature as any other Christians. This action somewhat lightened the execution without lessening the severity of the laws, for the last statute, passed in 1771, simply relieved the Baptist tax-payer from the necessity of presenting a certificate from three other Churches to prove him an 'Anabaptist.' The moral effect of many of the able documents drawn up by the Warren Association, Isaac Backus, and others, against these unrighteous laws, was very great on the thinking portion of the community, which compelled moderation when banishment and whipping became impossible. Virginia Baptists wrung some similar ameliorations from their Legislature which led them to throw themselves with all their hearts into the Revolutionary struggle, for they knew that if they secured full political independence religious freedom must necessarily follow.

It would furnish a splendid chapter in American Baptist History to sketch the honor-roll of the great fathers whom God was raising up from the first quarter of the eighteenth century to serve in the last, and who were to become the leaders in their contest for perfect religious emancipation. In addition to many

Chapter 11 - Baptists and the Revolutionary War

others who had fought the first battles, he raised up a special host who were to push this conflict to its close, from Isaac Backus to John Leland; the man who saw the last vestige of religious oppression wiped off the statute-book of Massachusetts, in 1834. She was the first of all the colonies to begin, and the last of all the States to end religious intolerance.

We have seen that ISAAC BACKUS, the Baptist historian, was born in Connecticut, January 9th, 1724, so that dying as late as November 20th, 1806, he lived through all the stages of the Revolution and saw his brethren as well as his country free. When the Warren Association appointed a committee to seek redress of grievances for the Baptists, and appointed first Hezekiah Smith, and then Rev. John Davis, their agent to the Court of Great Britain, Dr. Backus was exerting himself to the utmost in this direction. In the admirable biography of Backus by Dr. Hovey we have a graphic picture of the enthusiasm with which he threw himself into the work of changing the legislation from which his own Church at Middleborough had suffered so much, as well as his brethren elsewhere, he had been schooled in suffering for conscience' sake.

His mother, Elizabeth Tracy Backus, was a descendant from the Winslow family, and became a devout Christian three years before Isaac was born; she was of a very strong character, and brought up her son in the love and fear of God. With many others she became a Separatist at Norwich, and when left a widow refused to pay the State-Church tax, for conscience' sake. On the night of October 15th, 1752, when she was ill, and seated before the fire wrapped in thick clothing to induce perspiration, the officers came, and as she says in a letter to her son, dated November 4th, 1752, 'Took me away to prison, about nine o'clock, in a dark, rainy night. Brothers Hill and Sabins were brought there the next night. We

lay in prison thirteen days, and were then set at liberty, by what means I know not.' Her son Samuel lay in prison twenty days for the same crime. She evinced the essence of heroism, the genuine spirit of a confessor. The officer thought that she would yield when sick of a fever, and pay her rates rather than be cast into a doleful jail on a chill, stormy night in mid-October. Yet, hear her soul triumph, for she says:

'Oh! the condescension of heaven!
Though I was bound when cast into this
furnace, yet I was loosed and found Jesus in
the midst of a furnace with me. Oh, then I
could give up my name, estate, family, life
and health freely to God. Now the prison
looked like a palace to me. I could bless God
for all the laughs and scoffs made at me. Oh,
the love that flowed out to all mankind; then I
could forgive as I would desire to be forgiven,
and love my neighbor as myself. Deacon
Griswold was put in prison the 8th of October,
and yesterday old Brother Grover, and [they]
are in pursuit of others, all which calls for
humiliation. This Church has appointed the
13th of November to be spent in prayer and
fasting on that account. I do remember my
love to you and your wife and the dear
children of God with you, begging your
prayers for us in such a day of trial. We are all
in tolerable health, expecting to see you.
These are from your loving mother,
ELIZABETH BACKUS.'

The spirit of the mother was cherished by her son to the close of his life. The high esteem in which he is held is evinced in a private letter to Dr. Guild from Hon. George Bancroft, the historian, dated at Newport, R.I., September 25th, 1885, in which he writes: 'I look always to a Baptist historian for the ingenuousness, clear discernment, and determined accuracy which form the glory of their great historian Backus.'

SAMUEL STILLMAS, D.D., who was born in Philadelphia February 27th, 1737, and died March 12th, 1807, was another great Baptist

The American Baptists

leader during the Revolutionary period. At the age of eleven he removed with his parents to South Carolina, where he enjoyed the tuition of Mr. Hind, a classical tutor of renown. When still a youth, he was converted under the labors of Mr. Hart, by whom he was baptized and with whom he studied theology. In 1758, when he was but twenty-one years of age, he began to preach on James' Island, near Charleston. Ill health compelled him to spend two years at Bordentown, N.J., when he was invited to become assistant to Rev. Mr. Bound, in the Second Church, Boston, where he spent about a year; and January 9th, 1765, he became pastor of the First Church, Boston, which he served until his death, a period of forty-two years. The distinguishing traits of his character were purity of heart, and fidelity to his convictions. He was brilliant, and sought the highest intellectual attainments, but instinctively eschewed all literary pomp and display, particularly that academical donnishness of style which many scholastic notables affect. And yet, because of his extreme taste in manners, dress and bearing, clownish folk, whose vulgarity was an annoyance to him and an offense, were ever ready to assail him, even with censoriousness. Like Dr. Baldwin, he was dignified in his bearing, observing all those points of decorum which distinguished the careful pastor of New England in former days. Elias Smith, an eccentric minister of Boston, who caused his brethren considerable trouble, complains of Drs. Stillman and Baldwin for insisting that he should dress more becomingly, and for enforcing proper order in connection with his induction into the pastoral office. Dr. Cornell says, in his 'Recollections of Ye Olden Time,' that when Smith was settled as pastor over the Baptist Church at Woburn, in 1789, they required him to be 'installed.' This he denounced as a 'new-fangled ceremony,' but they insisted and he submitted. However, he

took his revenge in saying:

'Our popery was performed in the Congregational meeting-house, and it was a high day within. We made something of a splendid appearance as it respected the ignorant. We had two doctors of divinity, one or two A.M.'s, and we all wore bands. When we came out of the council chamber and walked in procession to the meeting-house, we looked as much like the cardinals coming out of the conclave after electing a pope, as our practice was like them. Dr. [Hezekiah] Smith said to me after Installation: "I advise you to wear a band on Lord's days." This was a piece of foppery I always hated, and when I walked over with it on I then thought I acted with it as a pig does when he is first yoked, and almost struck it with my knees for fear I should hit it. I should not have worn it that day but that Dr. Stillman, who was as fond of foppery as a little girl is of fine baby rags, brought one and put it on me.'

But, Elias Smith's crotchets to the contrary, Samuel Stillman was as noble a man and as holy a patriot as ever trod American soil. He read the signs of the times with a true eye, and stood in his lot to breast the Revolutionary storm as long as it was possible. He was ever delicate in health, but earnest and fearless. He was deeply stirred by the outrages inflicted upon the Baptists of Massachusetts, and especially upon those of Ashfield, and signed a powerful petition, of which he was evidently the author, to the General Court for redress. That body had already taken the ground politically 'that no taxation can be equitable where such restraint is laid upon the taxed as takes from him the liberty of giving his own money freely.' With the skill of a statesman Dr. Stillman seized this concession and used it thus: 'This being true, permit us to ask: With what equity is our property taken from us, not only without our consent, but violently, contrary to our will, and for such purposes as we cannot, in faithfulness to that stewardship with which God

hath intrusted us, favor?' He, therefore, asked a repeal of their unjust laws, damages for the losses of the Baptists, and their perpetual exemption from all State Church rates thereafter. In 1766, ten years before the Declaration, he denounced the Stamp Act from his pulpit; again sustained the Colonial cause in a sermon on the general election, 1770, and did not leave his post till the British troops occupied Boston, in 1775. Then his Church was scattered and for a short time he retired to Philadelphia, but in 1776 he returned; gathered his flock anew, and kept his Church open all through the war, when nearly all others were closed at times. His eloquence was easy, sympathetic, warm and cheerful; it was inspired with the freshness of a June morning, and it fascinated his hearers. He was nervous, kind, pure, healthful and welcome to all; his motions were all grace, his voice was as cheerful as the truth that he told, his eye was full of light, and altogether he was the pulpit orator of New England. The late William Williams pronounced him 'probably the most eloquent and most universally beloved clergyman that Boston has ever seen.' Nor would he on any account swerve from the radical principles of the Gospel. The elite of Boston crowded his place of worship. Dr. Pierce, late of Brookline, said that many a time he had walked from Dorchester when a boy, to get standing room in Stillman's meeting-house. And, commonly, John Adams, John Hancock, General Knox and other dignitaries delighted to mingle with the throng and listen to his expositions of depravity, sovereignty, retribution and redemption. On one occasion his denunciation of sin was so scathing and awful that a refined gentleman on leaving the house remarked: 'The doctor makes us all out a set of rascals, but he does it so gracefully and eloquently that I am not disposed to find fault.' The forty years which he spent in Boston covered the great

discussion of all that led to the war, the war itself, the birth of a new nation, and the adoption of the new Federal Constitution, together with the Presidency of Washington, Adams and Jefferson; he was a very decided Federalist in his political views. But all this time he was a leader in the councils of his brethren; and in their determined efforts to secure the sacred rights for which they suffered he never failed them.

Withal, he was everything that a Church could ask in a pastor; diligent, tender-hearted and spotless in his sanctity. His ministry brought many to the Lord, marked revivals of religion crowned his efforts, and he was the happiest of mortals in answering the question, 'What must I do to be saved?' His Church loved him with a peculiar reverence. Dr. Neale, one of his immortal successors, says of him:

'No pastor, before or since, was ever more beloved by his Church. His popularity was uninterrupted, and greater if possible in his old age than in his youth. A few individuals who sat under his ministry, and who were quite young when he was an old man, still survive and are present with us today. They never weary of talking about him, and even now speak of this as Dr. Stillman's Church. They looked at the venerable pastor not only with the profoundest respect, but with the observant eye of childhood. They noticed and remembered everything in his external appearance, his wig and gown and bands, his horse and carriage, and negro man, Jephtha; how he walked, how he talked, how he baptized; the peculiar manner in which he begun his prayers: "O thou Father of mercies and God of all grace."'

He oft expressed the wish that he might not outlive his influence, and God honored his desire. His last sermon was on the ascension of Christ, and two weeks after, he died of paralysis, his last words being: 'God's government is infinitely perfect.' Dr. Baldwin preached his funeral sermon from 2 Tim. 4:7,8,

The American Baptists

and Dr. Pierce says: 'I have a distinct recollection of the funeral. All the members of the society appeared with badges of mourning, the women with black bonnets and handkerchiefs. If the pastor had been removed in the bloom of youth his people could not have been more deeply affected.'

JAMES MANNING, D.D., may be mentioned next in chronological order, as a Baptist leader at the time of the Revolution. He was born at Elizabeth, N.J., October 22d, 1738, and died July 29th, 1791, so that in 1776 he was in the prime of his days. Under His influence, the Rhode Island College had come to be an established fact, the Warren Association had become a powerful body, and his influence throughout New England was very great. The exactions of the crown upon the Colonies had become so onerous in 1774 that they determined to meet in a common Congress for the purposes of calm deliberation and resistance, if necessary, but to defend their rights under any circumstances. The delegates met in Carpenter's Hall, Philadelphia, September 5th, 1774. At the meeting of the Warren Association, held at Medfield, September 14th, they resolved to address this first Continental Congress not only upon the political wrongs inflicted on the Colonies but upon their own privations, in that they were denied their rights as men to the free worship of God, and they sent Isaac Backus to present their case. He reached Philadelphia, October 8th, and on the 12th of that month the Philadelphia Association appointed a large committee to co-operate with the agent of the Warren Association. After consulting with a number of leading Quakers, they determined to seek a conference with the Massachusetts delegates rather than to address the Congress as such. Such a meeting having been arranged, they went to Carpenter's Hall, where they met Samuel and John Adams, Thomas Gushing and

Robert Treat Paine, from Massachusetts; James Kenzie, of New Jersey; Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward, of Rhode Island; Joseph Galloway and Thomas Mifflin of Pennsylvania, and several other members of Congress; with many members of the Society of Friends, as Joseph Fox, Israel and James Pemberton, who sympathized with the suffering Baptists. Dr. Manning opened the case in behalf of his brethren in a brief but eloquent address, and then submitted a memorial which they had adopted. Dr. Guild says of this paper, that it 'should be written in letters of gold and preserved in lasting remembrance.'

The first sentence couches the full Baptist doctrine in these ringing words: 'It has been said by a celebrated writer in politics, that but two things are worth contending for – Religion and Liberty. For the latter we are at present nobly exerting ourselves through all this extensive continent; and surely no one whose bosom feels the patriotic glow in behalf of civil liberty can remain torpid to the more ennobling flame of RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.' They go on to declare that the inalienable rights of conscience rank too high to be subjected to fallible legislators, as that dignity belongs to God alone. Men may legislate hypocritical consciences into existence, but cannot decree their fellow-men Christians. They had come to the free soil of Pennsylvania, to plead for that inestimable blessing which every lover of mankind should desire. They then described the sufferings of their brethren in Massachusetts, amongst those who had fled from oppression because they scorned domination over conscience, and yet had become ignoble oppressors themselves. They claimed their right to the free exercise of their religion under the charter, and referred to some ameliorations which had been granted to them in Massachusetts, but showed that these were a hollow mockery. For example, in 1728 their

Chapter 11 - Baptists and the Revolutionary War

persons were exempted from the religious tax, but not their property, if they did not live within five miles of a Baptist meeting-house; yet, in 1729, thirty persons, many of them Baptists, were confined in Bristol jail. In 1729, 1733, 1734, and 1747, under pretense of exempting their property from this tax, they had been subjected not only to all sorts of annoyances but to much severe suffering, until these systematic wrongs culminated in the outrages which robbed the Baptists at Ashfield, and sold their burying-grounds to build a Congregational meetinghouse; and they closed their appeal by pointing out the limits of human legislation, the just tenure of property, and the holy principles of Christianity, with the declaration that they were faithful citizens to all civil compacts; and hence, as Christians, they had a right to stand side by side with other Christians in the use of their consciences in religion.

This conference lasted four hours, and the Massachusetts delegation, having a hard case, tried to explain away the alleged facts as best they could, but exhibited much ill temper at the bare relation of these stinging facts. John Adams betrayed great weakness in this direction. He says that having been informed by Governors Hopkins and Ward, that President Manning and Mr. Backus wished to meet them on 'a little business,' they went to Carpenter's Hall, and there:

'To my great surprise found the hall almost full of people, and a great number of Quakers seated at the long table with their broad brimmed beavers on their heads. We were invited to seats among them, and informed that they had received complaints from some Anabaptists and some Friends in Massachusetts, against certain laws of that province restrictive of the liberty of conscience, and some instances were mentioned in the General Court, and in the courts of justice, in which Friends and Baptists had been grievously oppressed. I

know not how my colleagues felt, but I own I was greatly surprised and somewhat indignant, being, like my friend Chase, of a temper naturally quick and warm, at seeing our State and her delegates thus summoned before a self-created tribunal, which was neither legal nor constitutional. Isaac Pemberton, a Quaker of large property and more intrigue, began to speak, and said that Congress was here endeavoring to form a union of the Colonies; but there were difficulties in the way, and none of more importance than liberty of conscience. The laws of New England, and particularly of Massachusetts, were inconsistent with it, for they not only compelled men to pay to the building of churches and the support of ministers, but to go to some known religious assembly on first days, etc., and that he and his friends were desirous of engaging us to assure them that our State would repeal all those laws, and place things as they were in Pennsylvania.'

He then goes on to call the simple Quaker 'this artful Jesuit,' and to accuse him of attempting to break up the Congress by drawing off Pennsylvania; and then he put in this flimsy plea, which none but an 'indignant' man would have submitted when he was representing a great people in deliberation, concerning the surest way to break their fetters. He says that this was the substance of his own remarks:

'That the people of Massachusetts were as religious and conscientious as the people of Pennsylvania, that their conscience dictated to them that it was their duty to preserve these laws, and, therefore, the very liberty of conscience which Mr. Pemberton invoked would demand indulgence for the tender consciences of the people of Massachusetts, and allow them to preserve their laws...They might as well turn the heavenly bodies out of their annual and diurnal courses as the people of Massachusetts at the present day from their meeting-house and Sunday laws. Pemberton made no reply but this: "O! sir, pray don't urge liberty of conscience in favor of such laws!" Old Isaac Pemberton was quite rude, and his

The American Baptists

rudeness was resented.'

Clearly it was; but not much to the honor of John Adams, by his own showing. The Baptists had less objection to the Congregationalists taxing themselves to support their own ministers for conscience sake, if their consciences were 'tender' on that subject, than they had to that tenderness of Massachusetts conscience which compelled Baptists to support the Congregational ministry and their own too. This distinction seems to have been the rudeness in which Isaac Pemberton indulged and which Adams 'resented,' but just how 'indignant' Adams would have been if Lord North had insisted that the tender conscience of England compelled her to enforce her laws in Massachusetts does not appear. Probably he would have been more 'indignant' still. Every kind of misrepresentation went abroad concerning this conference, and in high quarters the Baptists were accused of trying to prevent the Colonies from uniting against Britain, the effect of which was to throw stigma on them as the enemies of their country, and it is even said that Backus, their unflinching agent, was threatened with the gallows. This slander they refuted in various documents, but the answer which silenced all such empty clamor was the hearty unanimity with which the whole body threw themselves into the support of the war when independence of Britain was proclaimed. Another strange episode of hatred revealed itself in this desperate struggle. When they could obtain no justice here, they appealed for help to their own brethren in London, and Dr. Stennett appeared with a plea for them before his majesty's Commissioners for Trade and Plantations. He begged their lordships to induce the king:

'To disallow an act passed in the Province of Massachusetts Bay in June, 1767, by which the Antipedo-Baptists and Quakers are

compelled to pay to the support of a minister of a different persuasion. Their lordships thereupon read and considered the said act, and it was ordered that a draught of a representation to His Majesty should be prepared, proposing that it may be disallowed.' On July 31, 1771, the King held a council, and 'His Majesty taking the same into consideration was pleased with the advice of his Privy Council to declare his disallowance of the said act, and to order that the said act be and it is hereby disallowed and rejected. Whereof the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, or Commander-in-Chief of His Majesty's said Province of Massachusetts Bay, for the time being, and all others whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.'

The loyalty of the baptists to the American cause was so clearly evinced, their appeals for equal rights were so well-balanced and reasonable, and their unyielding struggles for liberty were so open and manly, that at last they began to be felt and respected in public affairs. Schooled in conscience and scourged to unconquerable resistance to tyranny, they were driven to the use of every honorable incentive; like wise men, they organized for a long and severe contest; with Backus, Manning and Stillman at their head, and made their first attacks upon the strongholds of political Puritanism. Their powerful committee at Boston addressed a most statesmanlike document to the Congress of Massachusetts, which met at Cambridge, November 22d, 1774, in which they once more submitted their case. John Hancock, the president, presented the paper, and asked whether or not it should be read. The intolerants cried with one accord, 'No, no.' But a more considerate member rising said: 'This is very extraordinary, that we should pay no regard to a denomination who, in the place where he lived, were as good members of society as any, and were equally engaged with others in the defense of their civil liberties.' He

Chapter 11 - Baptists and the Revolutionary War

moved that it be read, and the motion was adopted. After the reading the general disposition was to throw it out unacted upon. By that time Mr. Adams began to feel uneasy, and, rising to his feet, said that he apprehended if it were thrown out it might cause a division amongst the provinces, and he moved its reference to a committee. On consideration the Congress sent this soft and civil answer:

'IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS',
CAMBRIDGE, December 9, 1774.

'On reading the memorial of the Rev. Isaac Backus, agent to the Baptist Churches in this government:

'Resolved, That the establishment of civil and religious liberty to each denomination in the province is the sincere wish of this Congress; but being by no means vested with powers of civil government, whereby they can redress the grievances of any person whatever, they therefore recommend to the Baptist Churches that when a General Assembly shall be convened in this colony they lay the real grievances of said Churches before the same, when and where this petition will most certainly meet with all that attention due to the memorial of a denomination of Christians so well disposed to the public weal of their country.

'By order of the Congress. JOHN HANCOCK, President.
BENJAMIN LINCOLN, Secretary.
A true extract from the minutes.'

The moral effect of this action on the public mind was very great, for it advised the Baptists what course to take in the matter of their 'real grievances,' and when the Assembly met, in October, 1775, a new and strong paper was sent for its consideration. Upon its presentation Major Hawley declared to the body that without doubt the Baptists had been injuriously treated, and the memorial was committed to seven members for deliberate consideration. Dr.

Asaph Fletcher, a Baptist, was on that committee, and after long debate it recommended redress of Baptist grievances. This caused great commotion in the House, and the memorial, with those who sent it, was severely attacked. Major Hawley defended both, and told the Assembly 'that the established religion of this colony was not worth a groat, and wished it might fall to the ground,' as Dr. Fletcher writes. After long discussion it ordered that Dr. Fletcher 'have liberty to bring in a bill for the redress of such grievances as he apprehends the Baptists labor under.' When this was passed, Mr. Gerry moved that the Baptists withdraw their memorial, for he was offended with the plain and sound manner in which it had put their wrongs on record. Hawley opposed this motion, wishing the paper to be put on file, for it was worthy; 'and he hoped it would be there till it had eaten out the present establishment.' Fletcher brought in a bill, which was read but never acted upon.

Dr. Manning was sent by the General Assembly of Rhode Island to the Continental Congress, 1786, where he served as their representative, with great honor to himself and his constituents, his voice and pen being ever ready to treat the great subjects under consideration with marked skill. He had great influence with the people of New England, and especially in Massachusetts and Rhode Island; which was felt in the most wholesome manner when the adoption of the Federal Constitution was stirringly opposed, for he cast his entire weight in its favor when it was in danger of rejection. He was far in advance of his times, both as a Baptist and an American. Broad, disinterested and self-sacrificing, his memory cannot be too sacredly cherished. He was manly and engaging in his address, spontaneous and forceful in his eloquence, symmetrical and powerful in body and mind, and, better than all besides, he was true to his holy convictions and

his redeeming Lord. Another grand but very different Baptist leader of these days was:

JOHN LELAND, born May 14th, 1754, at Grafton, Mass.; died January 14th, 1841. No three great men could differ more widely than Stillman, Manning and Leland. They were all wise in council and mighty in execution, but they worked in various departments of patriotic activity and readied different classes. Leland's convictions were as clear and deep as they well could be, but his tastes and habits, as well as his early training, all ran in other channels than these of his compeers. They were drilled in classic thought and expression; his associations had been with the pure, robust and sturdy plebeians of his youth. His powers were rare and natural; theirs were molded by culture. They were polished, measured, graceful; he followed the instincts of mother-wit, quick adaptation and eccentric eloquence. They readied the grave, the conservative and thoughtful; he moved the athletic masses. They did more to begin the Baptist struggle under the Federalism of the East; he lived to finish the triumph in the radical democracy of the South. It is, therefore, wonderful to see how exactly God adapted them to their fields and made them true yokefellows in the same holy cause.

Leland was baptized by Noah Alden, of Bellingham, Mass., in 1774, only two years before the war, and after the most intense soul-agonies on account of his sins and exposure to the second death. A year afterwards he took his first journey to New Jersey and Virginia. In 1776 he united with the Baptist Church at Mount Poney, in Culpeper County, and for a time was its pastor until he removed to Orange County. He spent much of his time in traveling at large and preaching the Gospel, spending about fifteen years of his ministry in Virginia, where he baptized about 700 persons on their faith in Christ. Dr. Semple said that he was probably the most popular preacher who ever

resided in Virginia. The late Dr. Cone loved to describe him as he heard him preach; in his own inimitable manner he would give the tones of his voice, his fertile genius in times of strait, his astonishing memory, especially of Scripture, and his vivacity and wit in handling an antagonist, expressed in home thrusts and cogent logic. And, withal, he always spoke of Leland's awful solemnity in addressing the Throne of Grace, and in enforcing the claims of God's justice, truth and benevolence. There was little of the sensational about him, but a tender unction often moved the crowds that followed him and led them without resistance to the atoning Lamb. He had many struggles of mind as to the most successful way of addressing sinners and of leading them to repentance, he was a Calvinist, but would not be bound by the methods of Gill; neither did Wesley or Andrew Fuller suit him; and for practical purposes he thought that two grains of Arminianism with three of Calvinism made a good proportion in preaching. He says that one time he was preaching when his soul got 'into the trade winds,' and when the Spirit of the Lord fell upon him he paid no attention either to Gill or Fuller, and five of his hearers confessed Christ. He was one of the bravest and most successful advocates of civil and religious liberty, and did a noble work with the Virginia Baptists in that direction. He believed that God had called him to a special mission to stand by his brethren in his adopted State; so that we find him side by side with Harris, Ford, Williams, Waller and others on every occasion where an inch of ground could be gained, he entered the State too late to suffer by persecution as a prisoner, but he was there in the thickest of the legal fight. To use his own words: 'The dragon roared with hideous peals, but was not red; the beast appeared formidable, but was not scarlet colored,' and his Virginia chronicles show that he was right.

Scarcely was the first shot fired at Lexington, when every Baptist on the continent sprung to his feet and hailed its echo as the pledge of deliverance, as well from domestic as foreign oppressors. They were amongst the first to suffer and to sacrifice, and then their enemies were mean enough to charge them with ingratitude to the king who had interposed for their help in Massachusetts. But nothing moved them from their steadfastness; hence, wherever the British standard was triumphant, their pastors were obliged to flee from their flocks, their meetinghouses were destroyed, and they were hated of all men. In common with all Whigs they were traitors to the crown, and the State Churches in New England and Virginia rendered it hard for them as fellow-patriots to fight comfortably at their side, because they set at naught religious exactions which these regarded in force, inflexible as laws of Media and Persia. It required plain, honest men, of Leland's will and nerve, to meet this state of things, and he never flinched, nor did his Virginia brethren. They organized their resistance as a denomination, and in May, 1775, sixty Churches met at the Dover Church, when their representatives resolved to address the Convention which Virginia had called to consider the state of the country. The address of the Baptists is spread upon the Journal of this political body. It states that they were alarmed at the oppressions which hung over America, and had determined that war should be made with Great Britain, that many of their brethren had enlisted as soldiers, and many more were ready to do so, and that they would encourage their young ministers to serve as chaplains in the army which should resist Great Britain. Also, they declared that 'Toleration by the civil government is not sufficient; that no State religions establishment ought to exist; that all religions denominations ought to stand upon the same footing; and that to all alike the protection

of the government should be extended, securing to them the peaceable enjoyment of their own religious principles and modes of worship.' These positions they argued and fortified at length, and they sent this memorial to the Convention by a Committee composed of Jeremiah Walker, John Williams and George Roberts. This Convention instructed the Virginia delegates in Congress to declare American independence on May 15th, 1776. Our brethren were wise in their generation; their deputation succeeding in enlisting Jefferson, Madison, and Patrick Henry, in their cause of full religious freedom. Dr. Hawks, in his 'History of the Episcopal Church in Virginia.,' says: 'The Baptists were not slow in discovering the advantageous position in which the political troubles of the country had placed them. Their numerical strength was such as to make it important to both sides to secure their influence; they knew this, and therefore determined to turn the circumstances to their profit as a sect. Persecution had taught them not to love the establishment, and now they saw before them a reasonable prospect of overturning it entirely. In their Association they had calmly discussed the matter, and resolved on their course; in this course they were consistent to the end.'

The bitterest persecutions which they had endured ran through the twelve years between 1763 and 1775, and they gained their full freedom only point by point and inch by inch; as is evident from the fact that all which the Convention could be induced to do, under the lead of the three great statesmen named, was to return a complimentary answer to the Baptists, and to pass an order that the ministers of other denominations should be placed on the same footing as chaplains of the Virginian army with those of the Episcopal Church. But this was really the first step gained toward equality by our Baptist brethren. A second, and much more

important one, was taken in 1776, when under the same influences the Virginia Declaration of Rights was adopted, June 12th, the XVth Article of which lays the Baptist principle of soul-liberty as the corner-stone of Virginia's government. This was followed, by a general petition, that all sects should be exempted from legal taxes for the support of any one particular Church, and on October 7th, 1776, the State salaries of the Episcopal clergy were suspended. Jefferson says that: 'The first Republican Legislature which met in 1776 was crowded with petitions to abolish this spiritual tyranny. These brought on the severest contest in which I was ever engaged,' and he adds that the measure to suspend this and certain other old laws touching the established Church was carried only after 'Desperate contests' in the Committee of the whole house, 'almost daily from the 11th of October to the 5th of December.' It was not until 1779 that these salaries paid by legal taxation were abolished forever.

During the struggle to abolish the State religion there arose a fear in the minds of many devout people, that Christianity itself might fall, or be so far impaired as to endanger the safety of the State, which is founded on true morality and religion. Even Patrick Henry felt some alarm here, champion as he was for religious liberty. He looked upon the success of the Republican movement, and rightly, as depending upon the virtue of the people, without which it must miserably fail. He saw that the influence of the war would be corrupting, that the country was threatened with the destructive ideas of France, and the religious teachers of the country were so poorly supported that he was alarmed, for he had never seen the working of the voluntary system on a large scale. In common, therefore, with many others, he caught the idea that the State authorities should regulate religion by imposing

a tax on all its citizens, leaving each person at liberty to appropriate his tax to the support of his own Church. This measure seemed healthful to and was supported by nearly all Christian denominations in Virginia except the Baptists, who refused to be taxed by the State even for the support of their own Churches. They took this ground on principle, namely: That the State had no jurisdiction in the matter, as the question of religion was left amongst His inalienable rights in the hands of every man, subject to his choice, and that Christianity needed no State support by compulsory measures; therefore, it was an abuse and a usurpation of power over the citizen for the State to touch the subject at all.

They said in their remonstrance: 'Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?' They argued that an established Church destroys all equality before the law, in the matter of religion, as it imposes burdens on some and exempts others. They insisted that the liberties of man and the prosperity of the Commonwealth required Virginia to renounce all interference in the religion of her citizens, in consequence of their resistance the Assessment Bill was defeated, and Dr. Hawks writes: 'The Baptists were the principal promoters of this work, and, in truth, aided more than any other denomination in its accomplishment.' A volume would be necessary for a full detail of the service which the Baptists rendered to their country, in her civic and military departments, during the Revolutionary War. A few individual cases may serve to illustrate the general interest which they took in the issue. In Virginia, Capt. M'Clanahan, a minister of Culpeper County, raised a military company of Baptists, with whom he served on the field both as captain and chaplain. Howe says that the

Legislature had invited the formation of such companies 'under officers of their own principles.' Semple tells us that Rev. David Barrow took his musket and did good service for his country in the conflict, winning great honor for himself also. Dr. Cone slates that his grandfather, Col. Joab Houghton, while attending worship in the Baptist meeting-house at Hopewell, N.J., met a messenger out of breath with the news of the defeat at Lexington. He kept silence till the services were closed, then in the open lot before the sanctuary detailed to the congregation: 'The story of the cowardly murder at Lexington by the royal troops, the heroic vengeance following hard upon it, the retreat of Percy, and the gathering of the children of the Pilgrims around the beleaguered city of Boston. Then pausing, and looking over the silent crowd, he said slowly: "Men of New Jersey, the red coats are murdering our brethren in New England. Who follows me to Boston?" Every man in that audience stepped out into line and answered, "I!" There was not a coward nor a traitor in old Hopewell meeting-house that day.' Col. Houghton continued in the army to the close of the war and fought valiantly. At one time a band of marauding Hessians had entered a New Jersey house at Moore's Mill, to plunder it, having stacked their arms at the door. He seized their arms and made their leader and a dozen men his prisoners, almost in sight of the British army. He was a member of the Hopewell Baptist Church, and died in 1795.

General Scriven, of Georgia, the grandson of Rev. William Scriven, was a brave soldier. After Savannah fell into the hands of the British forces, the officer in command ordered him to give up Sunbury also, and received the answer: 'Come and take it.' Afterwards he was slaughtered in an ambushade of British and Tories at Laurel Hill. Colonel Mills, who commanded 1,000 riflemen with great skill at

the battle of Long Island, was a deacon in the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia. Although captured with Generals Sullivan and Sterling, he was made a Brigadier-General for his valor. Colonel Loxley, who commanded the artillery at the battle of Germantown, of whom it was said, 'he was always foremost when great guns were in question,' was a member of the same Church.

John Brown, of Providence, R.I., brother to Nicholas, and a firm Baptist, owned twenty vessels liable to destruction by the enemy. In 1772, when the British war vessel *Gaspee* entered Narraganset Bay, to enforce British revenue customs, she ran aground, whereupon Brown sent eight boats, armed by sixty-four men, under the command of Abraham Whipple, one of his ship-masters, to destroy her. On opening fire Lieutenant Duddington was wounded, the rest of the officers and crew left, and the *Gaspee* was blown up. It has been said that 'this was the first British blood shed in the War of Independence.' We have another great patriot in the person of John Hart, who was a representative of New Jersey in the Continental Congress, and signed the Declaration of Independence. On the 23d of October, 1770, he had taken a leading part in passing the following resolution in the New Jersey Assembly: 'That no further provision be made for the supply of His Majesty's troops stationed in this colony.' This resolution startled the people, and the Governor threatened the Assembly so seriously that it annulled this action and voted £500 for the use of the army. Hart stood firm, voted against reconsideration, and in April, 1771, sustained the resolution, which was passed the second time. He was elected Speaker of the New Jersey Assembly after that State had declared itself free, and he was limited as an arrant traitor. The Legislature was obliged to flee from place to place, its members hiding themselves as best they could,

and Governor Parker says that when Hart returned to visit his home he found it deserted; 'the health of his wife, to whom he was devotedly attached, impaired by the cares of a large family and the alarm created by the near approach of the Hessians, had given way, and she died in the absence of her husband. His children had fled, and were concealed in various places in the mountains. His crops had been consumed by the enemy, and his stock driven away. He was compelled to fly to save his life, and for weeks he was a fugitive, limited from house to house, wandering through the forests and sleeping in caves.' When Washington crossed the Delaware, in the snow and hail and rain of that immortal night, December 25th, 1776, and found himself and his little band of heroes safe in Trenton the next morning, honest John Hart came forth from his hiding place, convened the Legislature for January 22d, 1777, and held his fidelity till his death, full of years and honors. He executed a deed to the Baptist Church at Hopewell, in 1771, giving the land on which their meeting-house is built, and led in the erection of the building where he and his family worshiped God. On July 4th, 1865, the State of New Jersey erected a beautiful monument, of Quincy granite, over his bones at Hopewell. He is represented as being tall and very prepossessing in person, very kind in his disposition, and he made a great favorite of his negro servant, Jack. Jack committed larceny on some of his master's goods in his absence, and many wished Hart to punish him; but he said that, as he had confided all his movables to Jack's care, he must let the offense pass as a breach of trust. When he was secreted in the Sourland Mountains, in 1776, he rested where he could in the day-time, and slept at night in an out-house, with his companion, the family dog. A marginal note on the journal of the Legislature for 1779, and the probate of his will, show that he died in that year; the first

of these being May 11th, and the last May 23d.

These few instances show the general tone of American patriotism amongst the American Baptists, for their ranks were almost unbroken on this subject. Judge Curwen was an ardent Tory; he mentions 926 persons of note who sympathized with the British, and a still more numerous array of Tories exiled by Colonial law; but, so far as is known, there is not the name of one Baptist on the list. Most of the officials of Rhode Island and about two fifths of her people were Baptists. In 1764 she formed a Committee of Correspondence, whose design it was to secure the co-operation of the other Colonies in maintaining their liberties. This chapter may well close with a brief notice of several baptist ministers who served as chaplains, for out of twenty-one whose names are now known, six of them, or nearly one third of the number, were our own brethren, who rendered marked service, some of them being of national reputation and influence. Mention may be made of:

HEZEKIAH SMITH, D.D., of Haverhill, Mass. He entered the army in 1776, and so noted did he become as a patriot that he not only attracted the notice of Washington, but became his personal friend, corresponded freely with him after the war, and was visited by him at Haverhill in 1789. Smith set an example of bravery to the soldiers in battle, as well as of devotion to their country and purity of character. His recently published journal throws considerable light upon the movements of Gates in foiling Burgoyne's attempt to join Clinton, and on his overthrow at Stillwater and Saratoga. We have already spoken of

REV. JOHN GANO, who was a patriot of the best order, as well as a noble pastor. He began his services in the army in Clinton's New York Brigade, and was indefatigable in animating his regiment at the battle of Chancellorsville. The army was in something of

a panic, and with cool courage he took his post in what seemed a forlorn hope. Many were abandoning their guns and flying without firing a shot, so that a mere handful were holding their ground when he sprang to the front. He states that he knew his station in time of action to be with the surgeons, and he half apologizes for his daring, saying: 'In this battle I somehow got to the front of the regiment, yet I durst not quit my place for fear of dampening the spirits of the soldiers or bringing on myself an imputation of cowardice.' he was at Fort Montgomery when it was taken by storm, but knew nothing of fear. Webb, Warren, Hall and Washington were all his personal friends. An interesting incident in his chaplaincy is related by Ruttenbeer, in His 'History of Newburg.' News was received that hostilities had ceased and that the preliminary articles of peace were settled; and on April 19th, 1783, Washington proclaimed peace from the 'New Building,' and called on the chaplains with the several brigades to render thanks to God. Both banks of the Hudson were lined by the patriot hosts, with drum and fife, burnished arms and floating banners. At high noon thirteen guns from Fort Putnam awoke the echoes of the Highlands, and the army fired a volley. At that moment the hosts of freedom bowed before God in prayer, after which a hymn of thanksgiving; floated from all voices to the Eternal throne. This building was not Washington's headquarters, but was a large room for public assemblies, sometimes called the 'Temple,' located in New Windsor, between Newburg and West Point. Thatcher says in his 'Journal' that when this touching scene occurred the proclamation made from the steps was followed by three huzzas, then prayer was offered to the Almighty Ruler of the world by Rev. JOHN GANO, and an anthem was performed by voices and instruments. After these services the army returned to quarters and spent the day in

suitable festivities. Then, at sundown, the signal gun of Fort Putnam called the soldiers to arms and another volley of joy rang all along the line. This was three times repeated, cannon discharges followed with the flashing of thousands of fire-arms, and the beacons from the hill-tops, no longer 'harbingers of danger,' lighted up the gloom and rolled on the tidings of peace through New England and shed their radiance on the blood-stained field of Lexington. Every patriotic Christian heart in the nation joined in the thanksgiving to which this patriot Baptist pastor gave expression in the presence of his immortal Commander-in-chief.

REV. DAVID JONES, born in Delaware, May 12th, 1736, was another eminent Baptist chaplain, he had been a student at the Hopewell Academy for three years, pastor at Freehold, N.J., and missionary to the Shawnee and Delaware Indians. At the outbreak of the war, however, he was pastor at Great Valley, Chester County, Pa. He was a bold and original thinker, and had highly offended many Tories in New Jersey by the free utterance of his Whig sentiments. The Continental Congress appointed a day of fasting and prayer in 1775, when he preached a powerful sermon in defense of the war to Colonel Dewee's regiment, which exerted a powerful influence on the public mind when printed. He became Chaplain to Colonel St. Clair's regiment in 1776, and greatly aroused the patriotism of the soldiers in a sermon just before the conflict at Ticonderoga. He served also under Gates and Wayne, and was so heroic that General Howe offered a reward for his capture, and one or more plots were laid to secure him, but failed. He preached to the army at Valley Forge, when the news came that France had recognized American independence. It seems to have been his custom to preach as often as possible before going into battle, and he remained in the army until the surrender of Cornwallis, at Yorktown. When

The American Baptists

Wayne was sent against the Indians, in 1794-96, he accompanied him as chaplain, and again in the same capacity he went through the war with Britain in 1812, under Generals Brown and Wilkinson. He was the father of Horatio Gates Jones, D.D., and grandfather of the present Hon. Horatio Gates Jones, of Philadelphia.

REV. WILLIAM VANHORN was another Baptist chaplain of note. His education had been committed to Dr. Samuel Jones, of Lower Dublin, Pa., and for thirteen years he was pastor of the Church at Southampton, in that State. His life in the army appears to have been marked by consistency, piety and industry, rather than by stirring acts of enterprise and daring. For twenty-one years he was pastor of the Church at Scotch Plains, N.J., where he closed his useful life greatly beloved by his flock.

REV. CHARGES THOMPSON ranked equally with his fellow-chaplains as a man of culture and vigor. He was born in New Jersey in 1748, and was the valedictorian of the first class which graduated from Rhode Island College under the Presidency of Dr. Manning, numbering seven, in 1769; he also succeeded the doctor as pastor at Warren. There he baptized Dr. William Williams, one of his classmates, who afterwards established the Academy at Wrentham. In 1778 the meeting-house and parsonage at Warren were burned by the British and Hessian troops, and Thompson entered the American army as chaplain, where he served for three years. He was a thorough

scholar and a finished gentleman, winning great distinction in the army. This exposed him to the special hatred of the enemy, who made him a prisoner of war and kept him on a guard-ship at Newport. He served many years as pastor at Swansea, and died of consumption in 1803. The last, and in some respects the most noted of our chaplains, was

WILLIAM ROGERS, D.D. He was born in Rhode Island in 1751, and graduated in the same class with Thompson. He was the first student received at that college, entering at the age of fourteen, and on the day of his graduation delivered an oration on benevolence. In 1773 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church at Philadelphia, and had been there three years when Pennsylvania raised her quota of soldiers for that province; he was first appointed chaplain, and afterwards Brigade Chaplain in the Continental Army. In 1778 he accompanied General Sullivan in his expedition against the Six Nations, at the head of 3,000 troops gathered at Wyoming. They marched north to Tioga Point, then on the frontier. His eminent ability and refined manners placed him on relations of intimate friendship with General Washington, and made him an ornament in our Churches. For years he served as Professor of English and Oratory in the College of Philadelphia and in the University of Pennsylvania. In battle, in camp, in hospitals or in the pulpit and the professor's chair he was alike at home, and a blessing to all around him.

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

Dr. Leonard Bacon writes of the Baptists in his 'New England Theocracy' thus: 'It has been claimed for these Churches that from the age of the Reformation onward they have been always foremost and always consistent in maintaining the doctrine of religious liberty. Let me not be understood as calling in question their right to so great an honor.' But until the American Revolution they had scant means, comparatively, to demonstrate the practical soundness of this claim. Yet when the field was open for experimental proof that it was well founded, they were not found faithless in their relations either to the free constitutions of the several States or to that of the United States. They had little to hope from most of their fellow-colonists, who had gone to the verge of their power in using all social and legal forces to persecute and destroy them as a religious body, and that phase of the question was solemnly considered by them. When Dr. Samuel Jones went as one of their committee to present their appeal to the Continental Congress he said: 'It seemed unreasonable to us that we should be called to stand up with them in defense of liberty, if, after all, it was to be a liberty for one party to oppress another.' The little Baptist colony of Rhode Island had more to lose and less to gain by revolution than any of her twelve sister colonies. Unlike Massachusetts and Virginia, she had no Governor appointed by the Crown, who could veto her acts of legislation. Bancroft tells us that this State enjoyed after the revolution, 'a form of government under its charter so thoroughly republican that no change was required beyond a renunciation of the King's name, in the style of its public acts.' Revolution would imperil her largest liberties, while complete success in the attempt to secure independence of Britain would add little to the rights which she already possessed. But should

she be conquered she must relinquish even these, for the Crown would appoint her a Governor and control her legislation, at least by the power of the veto.

Yet no selfish consideration of this sort weighed with the Baptists of Rhode Island. They saw their brethren of other colonies oppressed more than they were, and as their own love of liberty was a genuine growth, they demanded it as the birthright of all. Hence, they were as ready at once to resist encroachment upon the civil liberties of all the colonies as they had been to defy the unjust exactions of a spiritual tyranny upon themselves. They, therefore, carried with them into the struggle against civil oppression the same spirit which had moved them in resisting all encroachment upon the liberties of the soul. Two months before the Declaration of Independence, and thirty-two days before Virginia renounced allegiance to the Crown, Rhode Island repudiated all allegiance to George III, May 4th, 1776; and immediately after the retreat of General Gage from Concord and Lexington, her Legislature voted to send 1,500 men to the scene of conflict. It is, therefore, a significant testimony to the character of the teaching of Williams and Clarke that the boon which they had given the Rhode Islanders, first the town-meeting and then the Colonial Assembly shorn of all power to touch the question of 'conscience' and shut up to 'civil things,' should in the next century have borne such good fruit. Nearly five generations had passed since the colony was first planted, and now it was willing to imperil its own religious freedom in order to advance the political liberties of other communities. This brought no small strain upon its unselfish patriotism.

The Baptists of Virginia took an equally resolute step in favor of independence but though under different circumstances, not a jot

The American Baptists

less honorable. Notwithstanding their persecutions by the Colony itself, the moment that the State Convention met to determine the duty of the Colony, sixty Baptist Churches said to this civil body: Strike the blow! 'Make military resistance to Great Britain, in her unjust invasion, tyrannical oppression and repeated hostilities,' and we will sustain you, ministers and people. Virginia had no sympathy with Puritanism, and in her old devotion to the Stuarts had refused to recognize the authority of the Commonwealth. For this Massachusetts had prohibited all intercourse with her, and under the administration of George III, when Patrick Henry introduced His famous Fifth Resolution into the Virginia Legislature, containing the doctrine of revolution, denouncing the Stamp Act, and refusing taxation without representation, the leading men of that body cried with horror, 'Treason! treason!' Campbell, in his history of Virginia, says: 'Speaker Robinson, Peyton Randolph, Richard Bland, Edward Pendleton, George Wythe, and all the leaders in the House and proprietors of large estates made a strenuous resistance.' True, the wonderful eloquence of Henry secured a majority for the resolution, but the men who voted for it were so alarmed by the cry of treason which it provoked that the next day they secured its erasure from the records. One of the paradoxes of American history has been that, despite the sentiment of many of its leading men thus loyal to the Crown, Virginia should have finally taken front rank amongst the revolting colonies.

Jefferson, in his 'Notes on Virginia,' incidentally supplies the clue to this problem. He states that at the time of the Revolution two-thirds of her population had become Dissenters; for the most part they were Quakers, Presbyterians and Baptists. By the intolerable sufferings and indefatigable labors of the Baptist preachers they had cherished and

diffused their own love of liberty throughout the whole colony for half a century. Their memorial to the Convention had deeper root than the feeling of the hour; it was grounded in these evangelical convictions which were shared by a majority of the people of Virginia. That Virginia cast her Royalist antecedents aside and loyally espoused the cause of the revolution was largely due to the fact that Baptist suffering, preaching and democratic practice, had educated her people for the issue. Thomas Jefferson, possibly an advanced Unitarian; Patrick Henry, a devout Presbyterian; and James Madison, thought to be a liberal Episcopalian, felt the throb of the public heart, saw that its patriotism was founded upon religious conviction, and, like wise men, instead of stemming the strong tide they gave it their leadership, under which it swept on, notwithstanding the opposition of English rectors and the entangling traditions of a grinding hierarchy. The Baptists of Virginia, however, did not rush hastily into this struggle, nor were they without a definite purpose; they counted the cost and anticipated the legitimate result of their position. The records of the Colonial Convention, June 20th, 1776, say that:

'A petition of sundry persons of the Baptist Church, in the County of Prince William, whose names are thereunto subscribed, was presented to the Convention and read, setting forth that at a time when this colony, with the others, is contending for the civil rights of mankind, against the enslaving schemes of a powerful enemy, they are persuaded the strictest unanimity is necessary among ourselves; and that every remaining cause of division may if possible, be removed, they think it their duty to petition for the following religious privileges, which they have not yet been indulged with in this part of the world, to wit: That they be allowed to worship God in their own way, without interruption; that they be permitted to maintain their own minister's and none others;

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

that they may be married, buried and the like without paying the clergy of other denominations; that, these things granted, they will gladly unite with their brethren, and to the utmost of their ability promote the common cause. Ordered that the said petition be referred to the Committee of Propositions and Grievances; that they inquire into the allegations thereof and report the same, with their opinions thereupon, to the Convention.'

The Baptists concealed nothing. For full liberty, civil and religious, they were ready to give their lives and all that they had, but for less they would risk nothing: they might as well be the civil vassals of Britain as the religious vassals of a republic in Virginia. This was understood all around, and hence they kept influential commissioners in constant attendance on the Legislature and Conventions of the State, from the beginning to the close of the struggle for perfect religious freedom; or, as Bishop Meade expresses it, when their full rights were secured: 'The warfare begun by the Baptists seven and twenty years before was now finished.'

They had a great advantage in the fact that the three men who were the most prominently identified with the Revolutionary cause in Virginia espoused their cause and co-operated with them – Jefferson, Henry and Madison. This was not due, perhaps, on their part, to the same deep religious conviction which actuated the Baptists. But in their immense breadth of mind, logical adherence to conclusions drawn from those premises which justified the Revolution, brought these mighty men to the same positions. Thomas Jefferson comprehended Baptist aims perfectly, for he was in perpetual intercourse with their leading men, and they intrusted him with the charge of their public documents. His mother was an Episcopalian, but his favorite aunt, her sister, Mrs. Woodson, was a Baptist. These two sisters were the daughters of Ishain Randolph, Mrs.

Woodson residing in Goochland County. When young he loved to visit her house and accompany her to the Baptist Church, of which she and her husband were members. It is through the members of his uncle's and aunt's family, as well as through the Madisons, that the tradition has come down that he caught his first views of a democratic form of government while attending these meetings. A letter lies before the writer from Mrs. O.P. Moss, of Missouri, whose husband was a direct descendant of the Woodson family; his mother knew Jefferson intimately, and has kept the tradition alive in the family. She says that 'when grown to manhood these impressions became so fixed that upon them he formulated the plan of a free government and based the Declaration of Independence.' Jefferson himself speaks of his close intimacy with the Baptists in the following epistle, already referred to in Chapter VIII:

'To the members of the Baptist Church of Buck Mountain, in Albemarle; Monticello, April 13th, 1809:

'I thank you, my friends and neighbors, for your kind congratulations on my return to my native home, and of the opportunities it will give me of enjoying, amidst your affections, the comforts of retirement and rest. Your approbation of my conduct is the more valued as you have best known me, and is an ample reward for any services I may have rendered. We have acted together from the origin to the end of a memorable revolution, and we have contributed, each in the line allotted to us, our endeavors to render its issues a permanent blessing to our country. That our social intercourse may, to the evening of our days, be cheered and cemented by witnessing the freedom and happiness for which we have labored, will be my constant prayer. Accept the offering of my affectionate esteem and respect.'

Elder John Leland speaks of his intimacy with Jefferson. In his Address on an Elective

The American Baptists

Judiciary, he found it necessary to repel certain charges against his beau ideal statesman, and says: 'I lived in Virginia, from December 1776, until April, 1791, not far from Monticello; yet I never heard a syllable of either of these crimes.' There was a oneness of views and a mutual esteem in all that relates to religious liberty between him and the Baptists. John Leland was in constant communication with him on this subject, and he only spoke their sentiments when he said of Jefferson, that 'By his writing and administration, he has justly acquired the title of the Apostle of Liberty.' The replies of Jefferson to three Baptist Associations, and to the Baptists of Virginia in General Meeting assembled, speak of the satisfaction which the review of his times gave him, in remembering his long and earnest cooperation with them in achieving the religious freedom of America.

Early in his life Patrick Henry evinced his deep sympathy with them on the same point, for Semple says of the immortal patriot and orator and of the efforts to attain full liberty of conscience:

'It was in making these attempts that they were so fortunate as to interest in their behalf the celebrated Patrick Henry; being always the friend of liberty, he only needed to be informed of their oppression — without hesitation, he stepped forward to their relief. From that time, until the day of their complete emancipation from the shackles of tyranny, the Baptists found in Patrick Henry an unwavering friend.'

It is supposed that he drew up the noble petition of the Presbytery of Hanover, addressed to the Virginia Colonial Convention, in favor of religious liberty, Oct. 7th, 1776, and if he did, it is enough to render his name immortal, for no abler document on the subject was ever submitted to that or any other body. William Wirt Henry, his grandson, claims, that

his renowned ancestor was the real author of the sixteenth section of the Virginia Bill of Rights, which guarantees perfect religious liberty. George Mason, Edmund Randolph and Patrick Henry were all members of the Committee that framed it; and Randolph says, that when Mason submitted his draft for the consideration of the Committee, he had not made proper provisions for religious liberty. Whereupon, Patrick Henry proposed the fifteenth and sixteenth sections in these words:

'That no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to Justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles. That religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, and not by force or violence; and, therefore, that all men should enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, unpunished and unrestrained by the magistrates, unless, under the color of religion, any man disturb the peace, the happiness, or the safety of society; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other.'

Mr. Madison, however, who was also a member of the Committee, detected serious danger lurking in the word 'toleration,' and moved this amendment, which was adopted, first by the Committee, and on May 6, 1776, by the Convention:

'That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity toward each other.'

Jefferson was not in the Convention which

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

framed this Bill, but nine years afterwards he served on a Committee of the General Assembly to revise the laws for the new State, when he submitted the following, which was adopted, Dec. 16, 1785, and is still the fundamental law of Virginia.

'An Act to establish Religious Freedom:

'Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.'

James Madison had as close relationship to the Baptists as his two illustrious peers, and made himself intimately acquainted with their radical views on the subject of religious equality. Honest John Leland says of him: 'From a child, he was a pattern of sobriety, sturdy and inflexible justice. From an intimate acquaintance with him, I feel satisfied that all the State of Massachusetts, for a bribe, would not buy a single vote of him. A saying of His is fresh in my memory: "It is ridiculous for a man to make use of underhand means to carry a point, although he should know the point is a good one; it would be doing evil that good might come." This saying of his better describes the man than my pen can do.' General Madison, his brother, was a member of a Baptist Church, and their family took a deep interest in the struggles of the denomination. James was one of the youngest members of the Convention which adopted the Bill of Rights, and it required no small judgment and nerve to oppose the idea of 'toleration' on abstract principles there, or to support the tenet that 'all

men are entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to their own consciences.' One measure succeeded another, in opposition to the legally established religion of Virginia, in which the Baptists took the leading part at times, and on some measures stood entirely alone, until in the main, through the influence of these three great statesmen, the last step was taken in 1802; the glebes were ordered to be sold in payment of the public debt, on the ground that they had been purchased by a public tax, and belonged to the State. Thus ended the struggle for religious liberty in Virginia, and with the disappearance of the Established Church, the last vestige of ecclesiastical tyranny was wiped from the statute-books of that State.

The most worthy Baptist writers have never claimed that their Baptist fathers achieved this grand result alone, nor could such a claim be sustained. They were the most numerous body of dissenters in Virginia, and were a unit in this effort, but they were earnestly aided by all the Quakers and most of the Presbyterians, as lesser but influential bodies. 'Tories' and 'traitors' were held at a large discount in both these denominations, and there were few of them. Indeed, so far as appears, the twenty-seven Presbyterians who met at Charlotte, N.C., May, 1775, to represent the County of Mecklenburg in patriotic convention, were the first American body which declared itself 'a free and independent people; (who) are, and of right ought to be, a sovereign and self-governing association, under the control of no power other than that of our God and the general government of the Congress.' Besides, at that time, there were good reasons why the Quakers, Presbyterians and Baptists should stand firmly together in favor of religious liberty. From 1749, a plan had been openly pushed in England, to force an American Episcopate on all the American Colonies; it excited the

The American Baptists

deepest alarm in all the non-Episcopal Churches, and did much to fan the revolutionary flame. In 1773 the 'Quebec Act,' to prevent Canada from uniting with the thirteen colonies, had given full freedom of worship and right of property to the Roman Catholic Church there. England also enlarged that province, by extending its lines to the Mississippi on the west, and the Ohio on the south, so that the five States, now northwest of the Ohio, were then included in Canada. Most of the Protestants in the thirteen colonies regarded this as an English attempt to establish that Church. As to this Protestant Episcopate, Graham says, in His 'Colonial History of the United States.' (ii., 194):

'The most politic of all the schemes that were at this time proposed in the British Cabinet, was a project of introducing an ecclesiastical establishment, derived from the model of the Church of England, and particularly the order of the bishops, into North America. The pretext assigned for this innovation was, that many non-juring clergymen of the Episcopal persuasion, attached to the cause of the Pretender, had recently emigrated from Britain to America, and that it was desirable to create a board of ecclesiastical dignitaries for the purpose of controlling their proceedings and counteracting their influence; but doubtless it was intended, in part, at least, to answer the ends of strengthening royal prerogative in America – of giving to the State, through the Church of England, an accession of influence over the colonists – and of imparting to their institutions a greater degree of aristocratical character and tendency. The views of the statesmen by whom this design was entertained were inspired by the suggestions of Butler, Bishop of Durham, and were continued and seconded by Seeker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the society instituted for the propagation of the Gospel. This society had received very erroneous impressions of the religious character of the colonists in general, from some worthless and

incapable missionaries, which it sent to America; and Seeker, who partook of these impressions, had promulgated them from the pulpit in a strain of vehement and presumptuous invective. Such demeanor by no means tended to conciliate the favor of the Americans to the proposed ecclesiastical establishment. From the intolerance and bitterness of spirit disclosed by the chief promoters of the scheme, it was natural to forebode a total absence of moderation in the conduct of it.'

This iniquitous plan, added to all the other oppressions of Britain, alarmed New England, for, as John Adams said: 'The objection was not merely to the office of a bishop, though even that was dreaded, but to the authority of Parliament, on which it must be founded...If Parliament can erect dioceses and appoint bishops, they may introduce the whole hierarchy, establish tithes, forbid marriages and funerals, establish religion, forbid dissenters.' In 1708, the Assembly of Massachusetts appointed its Speaker, Mr. Cushing, James Otis, Mr. Adams, John Hancock and five others, a Committee on the Consideration of Public Affairs. In treating of this grievance they say to Mr. Deberdt, the agent of Massachusetts in England:

'The establishment of a Protestant episcopate in America is also very zealously contended for; and it is very alarming to a people whose fathers, from the hardships which they suffered under such an establishment, were obliged to fly their native country into a wilderness, in order peaceably to enjoy their privileges, civil and religious. Their being threatened with loss of both at once must throw them into a disagreeable situation. We hope in God such an establishment may never take place in America, and we desire you would strenuously oppose it. The revenue raised in America, for aught we can tell, may be as constitutionally applied towards the support of prelacy, as of soldiers and pensioners.'

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

It is not needful to quote authorities to show that Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey were specially excited on the subject, but it may be stated that Virginia resented the aggression as warmly as any of her sister colonies. Boucher, the Episcopal historian in Virginia, espoused the scheme warmly, and in a sermon on 'The American Episcopate,' preached in Caroline County, Va., in 1771, says:

'The constitution of the Church of England is approved, confirmed and adopted by our laws and interwoven with them. No other form of Church government than that of the Church of England would be compatible with the form of our civil government. No other colony has retained so large a portion of the monarchical part of the British constitution as Virginia; and between that attachment to monarchy and the government of the Church of England, there is a strong connection...A levelling republican spirit in the Church naturally leads to republicanism in the State; neither of which would hitherto have been endured in this ancient dominion...And when it is recollected that till now the opposition to an American episcopate has been contained chiefly to the demagogues and independents of the New England provinces, but that it is now espoused with much warmth by the people of Virginia, it requires no great depth of political sagacity to see what the motives and views of the former have been, or what will be the consequences of the defection of the latter.'

The tobacco crop in Virginia was light in 1755 and again in 1758, and the price ran up. Debts had been paid in that staple, but the Assembly decreed that they might now be paid in money at the rate of two pence for a pound of tobacco. The salaries of sixty-five parish ministers were payable in tobacco, and at this rate they were heavy losers. Through Sherlock, Bishop of London, they induced the Council there to pronounce this law void and commenced suits to recover the difference between two pence per pound and the value of

the tobacco. As a lawyer, Patrick Henry took sides against the parsons. In the case of Maury, who was to be paid in 16,000 pounds of tobacco, he raised the issue that the King in Council could not annul the law of Virginia. This was his plea in part:

'Except you are disposed yourselves to rivet the chains of bondage on your own necks, do not let slip the opportunity now offered of making such an example of the Rev. plaintiff, as shall hereafter be a warning to himself and his brothers not to have the temerity to dispute the validity of laws authenticated by the only sanction which can give force to laws for the government of this colony, the authority of its own legal representatives, with its council and governor.'

When the jury fixed the damages at one penny, the Bishop of London said that the 'rights of the clergy and the authority of the king must stand or fall together,' and so a joint constitutional and ecclesiastical question met the new question of an episcopate at the first step. This question brought the Presbyterians and Baptists to common ground, with slight exceptions. The Presbyterians had not been true to the principle of full religious liberty in the Old World more than the Congregationalists had been in the New, and thousands of them had found a home in Virginia as early as 1738, under the promise of protection from that colony. They came to have a touch of fellow-feeling with their suffering Baptist brethren, hence they were able to say in their *Hanover Memorial*, of 1777: In this enlightened age, and in a land where all of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious as well as civil bondage. Certain it is that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion.' 'Honor to

whom honor,' the Bible demands.

While this contest was in progress, however, another, quite as warm and vastly more important, was waged in regard to the Constitution of the United States, and chiefly through the same agencies. This great civil document was adopted by the Constitutional Convention and submitted for ratification to the several States, September 17th, 1787, nine States being needed to ratify the same. Immediately it met with strong opposition from all the States, some for one reason and some for another. Its only provision on the subject of religion was found in Article VI, thus: 'No religious Test shall ever be required, as a Qualification to any office or public Trust under the United States.' Great dissatisfaction prevailed with many of its provisions, and there was serious danger of its rejection for a time. Dissatisfaction with this provision lodged with the Baptists in all the States, but Virginia became their great battlefield. On the 7th of March, 1788, the representatives of all their Churches met in their General Committee in Goochland, and the minutes of the meeting say: The first Religious Political subject that was taken up was: 'Whether the new Federal Constitution, which had now lately made its appearance in public, made sufficient provision for the secure enjoyment of religious liberty; on which it was agreed unanimously that it did not.' Many of the political and social leaders of Virginia were opposed to the Constitution, and amongst them Patrick Henry, who resisted its adoption in the Virginia Convention, because, as he phrased his difficulty, it 'squinted toward monarchy,' and gave no guarantee of religious liberty.

Here a pleasant incident may be noticed, in which John Leland figures very honorably. James Madison led the Virginia party which favored ratification, but was in Philadelphia during the election of delegates to the State

Convention, engaged with John Jay and Alexander Hamilton in preparing that memorable series of political papers, written in defense of the Constitution, and known as the 'Federalist.' When he returned to Virginia, he found that Leland had been nominated in Orange, his own county, by the party opposed to ratification, against himself, as the delegate in favor of that measure. Governor George N. Briggs, of Massachusetts, says, that Leland told him that Madison called on him and carefully explained the purposes of the Constitution with his arguments in its support. The opposing candidates soon met at a political meeting, in the presence of most of the voters, when Madison mounted a hogshead of tobacco, and for two hours addressed his fellow-citizens in a calm, candid and statesmanlike manner, presenting his side of the case and meeting all the arguments of his opponents. Though he was not eloquent, the people listened with profound respect, and said Leland: 'When he left the hogshead, and my friends called for me, I took it, and went in for Mr. Madison.' 'A noble Christian patriot,' remarks Governor Briggs; 'that single act, with the motives which prompted it and the consequences which followed it, entitled him to the respect of mankind.' Leland's advocacy of Madison's claim to a seat in the Convention led directly to the adoption of the Constitution by Virginia, for at the time of his election it was confirmed by only eight States, Hence, the ninth was absolutely necessary, and at the moment every thing appeared to turn on the action of Virginia. New Hampshire, however, approved the instrument on the 21st of June, but five days before Virginia, and New York followed one month later, namely, on July 26th, 1788. Up to this time, none of the other States had proposed the full expression of religious liberty in the organic law of the United States; this honor was reserved for Virginia. But the struggle was a

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

hard one, and Madison, who at first insisted on its ratification precisely as it was, was obliged to save it by shifting his position. Henry submitted a number of amendments, demanding that they be engrafted into the instrument before it received Virginia's sanction. Amongst these was a Bill of Rights, of which the following was the 20th section, namely:

'The religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men have an equal, natural, and inalienable right to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience, and that no particular sect or society ought to be favored or established by law in preference to others.'

At last Mr. Madison conceded the need of amendments, but urged the danger of disunion and the jeopardy of losing the Constitution, and recommended that the Convention ratify it then, which it proceeded to do; but in connection with that act it also recommended the amendments and directed its representatives in Congress to urge their embodiment in the Constitution. On the 26th of June, 1788, Virginia ratified the great charter, but by the narrow majority of eight votes out of 168. From that moment a most exciting controversy arose in other States on the subject of so altering the Federal Constitution as to make it the fundamental law, providing for religious liberty and equality as the right of all the inhabitants of the land. The Baptists of the whole country aroused themselves and opened a simultaneous movement in that direction. Those of Virginia sent Leland to their brethren of New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and other States to solicit their co-operation, which was granted with but few exceptions. There seems to have been a direct union of effort between the Baptists and the Virginia statesmen on this

subject, although the Virginian leaders were divided on other subjects. Patrick Henry became the leader in the next State Legislature and induced that body to memorialize Congress to amend the new Constitution. But fearing that after all Mr. Madison might not heartily sustain that measure, he defeated Madison's election to the United States Senate, and secured the return of Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson, who were pledged to sustain the amendments. Madison was then elected to the Lower house of Congress from his own district, under the pledge that he would sustain them there. At this stage the Baptists consulted with Madison as to what they had better do under the circumstances, and he recommended them to address General Washington, the new President of the Republic, on the question. This suggestion they followed. They drew up a formal and well-digested presentation of the case, drafted, it is said, by Elder Leland, and sent it to General Washington by a special delegation. This paper is too long to transcribe here, but a synopsis may be given. It was entitled an '*Address of the Committee of the United Baptist Churches of Virginia, assembled in the City of Richmond, 8th August, 1789, to the President of the United States of America.*' After a full review of the terrible conflicts and sacrifices of the Revolution, and the acknowledgment of debt on the part of the country to his great skill and leadership, they say:

'The want of efficiency in the confederation, the redundancy of laws, and their partial administration in the States, called aloud for a new arrangement of our systems. The wisdom of the States for that purpose was collected in a grand convention, over which you, sir, had the honor to preside. A national government in all its parts was recommended as the only preservation of the Union, which plan of government is now in actual operation. When the Constitution first made its

The American Baptists

appearance in Virginia, we, as a society, feared that the liberty of conscience, dearer to us than property or life, was not sufficiently secured. Perhaps our jealousies were heightened by the usage we received in Virginia, under the regal government, when mobs, fines, bonds and prisons were our frequent repast. Convinced, on the one hand, that without an effective national government the States would fall into disunion and all the subsequent evils; and, on the other hand, fearing that we should be accessory to some religious oppression, should any one society in the Union predominate over the rest; yet, amidst all these inquietudes of mind, our consolation arose from this consideration – the plan must be good, for it has the signature of a tried, trusty friend, and if religious liberty is rather insecure in the Constitution, "the Administration will certainly prevent all oppression, for a WASHINGTON will preside."...Should the horrid evils that have been so pestiferous in Asia and Europe, faction, ambition, war, perfidy, fraud and persecution for conscience' sake, ever approach the borders of our happy nation, may the name and administration of our beloved President, like the radiant source of day, scatter all those dark clouds from the American hemisphere.'

After gracefully expressing their gratitude for his 'great and unparalleled services,' and confiding him in prayer to the 'Divine Being,' the paper is signed: 'By order of the Committee, SAMUEL HARRIS, *Chairman*, and REUBEN FORD, *Clerk*.'

General Washington's reply was addressed '*To the General Committee, representing the United Baptist Churches in Virginia*.' After thanking them for their congratulations, and expressing his own gratitude to 'Divine Providence' for blessing his public services, he proceeds to write thus:

'If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed by the Convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious

rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution. For, you doubtless remember, I have often expressed my sentiments that any man, conducting himself as a good citizen and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience. While I recollect with satisfaction, that the religious society of which you are members have been, throughout America, uniformly and almost unanimously the firm friends to civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be the faithful supporters of a free yet efficient general government. Under this pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely upon my best wishes and endeavors to advance their prosperity,

'I am, gentlemen, your most obedient servant,

GEORGE WASHINGTON.'

A month after this correspondence James Madison, with the approval of Washington, brought several Constitutional amendments before the House of Representatives, and amongst them moved the adoption of this: 'Article 1. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.' The chief difference between the old Article VI and this amendment lay in the fact that in the first instance Congress was left at liberty to impose religious tests in other cases than those of 'office or public trust under the United States,' whereas, this amendment

removed the power to make any 'law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This proposition met with great opposition in Congress, but it passed that body September 23d, 1789, and was submitted to the several States for ratification. Eleven of the thirteen States adopted it between November 20th, 1789, and December 10th, 1791, New Jersey voting on the first of these dates and Virginia on the last, and all the rest between, those periods excepting Connecticut and Massachusetts. Thus, the contemned, spurned and hated old Baptist doctrine of soul-liberty, for which blood had been shed for centuries, was not only engrafted into the organic law of the United States, but for the first time in the formation of a great nation it was made its chief corner-stone. For the first time on that subject the quiet, pungent old truth asserted its right to immortality as expressed by Scripture: 'The stone which the builders rejected is become the head-stone of the corner.'

But this August event did not end the strife for religious freedom on American soil; the battle must be still pressed on the soil of New England. Drs. James Manning, Samuel Stillman and Isaac Backus had work enough left in Massachusetts. The loyalty of all classes to the full principles of the Revolution was not so easily won, because a large body of the people there were not in favor of entire separation between Church and State. Even John Adams wrote: 'I am for the most liberal toleration of all denominations, but I hope Congress will never meddle with religion further than to say their own prayers.' Yet he thought it as impossible to 'change the religious laws of Massachusetts as the movements of the heavenly bodies.' There was the same opposition in Massachusetts to the ratification of the United States Constitution that there was in Virginia, and much for the same reasons. Isaac Backus took about the same ground that Patrick Henry had taken in

Virginia, because he could not see that it sufficiently guaranteed religious liberty. Manning and Stillman were wiser in their generation. Stillman had been chosen a delegate from Boston to the State Convention of Massachusetts, which was to accept or reject this instrument, a body numbering nearly 400 members. Manning hastened to Massachusetts, and for two weeks was indefatigable in argument and appeal to induce all Baptist delegates and other Baptists of influence to aid in securing first all that the unamended Constitution did secure. It was a very grave crisis, the public spirit was in a feverish state, and these two great men had their hands full to secure the full support of their own brethren. They knew that this document had not secured everything needful to them, but they also knew that such a revolution could not go backward excepting through alienation between the States. The Convention was in session for a month, half of which time Stillman and Manning were at work, and when the final vote was taken the Constitution was ratified by 187 to 168 votes. Massachusetts adopted the Constitution of the United States February 6th, 1788. After the vote, in which the Baptists held the balance of power, John Hancock, the President of the Convention, invited Dr. Manning to return thanks to God, and it is said that the lofty spirit of purity and patriotism which marked his prayer filled the Convention with reverence and awe.

So far as the Massachusetts Baptists were concerned, this great opportunity was neither missed nor mismanaged, but was made an important step toward absolute freedom. Massachusetts had formed a State Constitution in 1780, and in that Convention the Baptists contended with pertinacity for their religious rights. Rev. Noah Alden, a lineal descendant of the Plymouth family, was a member of this Convention, and at that time pastor of the

Baptist Church at Bellingham. He was also a member of the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States. When the famous Massachusetts Bill of Rights was reported he moved to recommit the third article, which gave power to the rulers in religious affairs. He was made a member of a committee of seven to consider the subject, and although he could not secure equality before the law for all sects in Massachusetts, he did procure so much concession as to excite marvel at the time, it was so far in advance of anything that this State had previously known in religious liberality. It recognized the power of the civil rulers to provide for the support of religion in towns where such provision was not made voluntarily; it required attendance on public worship, if there were any religious teachers 'on whose instructions they can conscientiously and conveniently attend;' it provided that the people should 'have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance;' it gave the right of the hearer to apply his public payments of religious tax 'to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instruction he attends,' and 'every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably and as good subjects of the commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law, and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.' This wonderful gain in the Bill of Rights did not dis-establish the Church in Massachusetts, which was still protected under the several exceptions of the article, but it broke its tyrannical power, and in a little more than half a century it wrought the entire separation of Church and State in Massachusetts. It met with the most violent resistance in the Convention, and a leader of the opposition said: 'We believe in our consciences

that the best way to serve God is to have religion protected and ministers of the Gospel supported by law, and we hope that no gentleman here will wish to wound our tender consciences.' 'The plain English of which,' says Leland, 'is, our consciences dictate that all the commonwealth of Massachusetts must submit to our judgments, and if they do not they will wound our tender consciences.' Alden was nobly sustained in this Convention by Dr. Asaph Fletcher, who was also a member, and a strong advocate of this measure. Under its provisions many ungracious acts were perpetrated, and all sorts of quibbles, pretexts and pleas that ingenious but wounded pride could invent were invoked to annoy the Baptists, but this Bill struck a death-blow at persecution proper in Massachusetts.

The new Constitution was soon put to the test, for several persons were taxed at Attleboro, in 1780, to support the parish Church, although they attended elsewhere. Elijah Balkom was seized, and having sued the assessors for damages, judgment was had against him; but, on an appeal to the County Court at Taunton, he obtained damages and costs. In 1783 a similar case, in many respects, occurred in Cambridge, where Baptists were sued to support the Standing Order, and their money extorted, but they sued for its return and it was paid back. These annoyances continued and sometimes were grievous enough. In a letter from Dr. Backus to William Richards, dated May 28th, 1796, he says: 'Though the teachers and rulers in the uppermost party in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Vermont are as earnest as ever Pharaoh was to hold the Church of Christ under the taxing power of the world, yet that power is daily consuming by the spirit of God's mouth.' To meet and thwart these attempts the Warren Association kept a vigilant committee in existence. In 1797 it consisted of Drs. Stillman,

Chapter 12 - The American Baptists and Constitutional Liberty

Smith and Backus, with Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Grafton, to whom the oppressed Churches appealed for counsel and help, and they did good service indeed. John Leland said, 1801: 'In the year 1800 about six hundred dollars were taken from the Baptists, in Partridge-field, for the building of a meeting-house in said town for another denomination. The case is now in law, hung up, and what the event will be we know not.' Great hopes were entertained that the Convention held November 3d, 1820, to amend the Constitution, would entirely dissolve the last bond of union between Church and State in Massachusetts; but this was defeated, chiefly by the determined opposition of John Adams, who was a member of that body.

Isaac Backus died in 1806, after a life of astonishing activity in the cause of religious freedom. But his survivors adopted the motto of Caesar, 'that nothing is done while anything remains undone,' and they pressed their case with new zeal, encouraged by their gains in securing a modification of the Bill of Rights. The dissatisfaction with the partial measure, however, was very great. Leland gave it voice in many addresses and in numerous articles from the press. He said:

'The late Convention, called to revise the Constitution, still retains the same principle. Strange, indeed, that Massachusetts, all alone, in opposition to all the other States, should still view religion a principle of State policy, the Church a creature of State, and ministers in the light of State pensioners! That the Legislature should have the power to clothe the majority of each town or parish with authority to compel the people, by a legal tax, to support the religious teachers among them. What a pity! When will men realize that a constitution of civil government is a charter of powers bestowed and of rights retained, and that private judgment and religious opinions are inalienable in their nature, like sight and hearing, and cannot be surrendered to society. Consequently, it must be impious usurpation

for ecclesiastics or civilians to legislate about religion.'

In 1811 Judge Parsons gave a decision to the effect, that no congregation or society not incorporated by law could claim all the privileges which the dissenters claimed under the Bill of Rights, and alarm awakened them throughout the State. Petitions were circulated everywhere and sent to the Legislature, praying for a revision of the religious laws, and the people of Cheshire elected Elder Leland to that body for the purpose of pleading their cause. There he delivered that remarkable speech, in which reasoning, satire, eloquent declamation and sound statesmanship hold such equal and changeful parts. The following characteristic extracts are not familiar to the present generation of Baptists and may be reproduced:

'Mr. Speaker, according to a late decision of the bench, in the County of Cumberland, which, it is presumed, is to be a precedent for future decisions, these non-incorporated societies are nobody, can do nothing, and are never to be known except in shearing time, when their money is wanted to support teachers that they never hear. And all this must be done for the good of the State. One hundred and seventeen years ago wearing long hair was considered the crying sin of the land. A convention was called March 18, 1694, in Boston, to prevent it; after a long expostulation the Convention close thus: "If any man will now presume to wear long hair, let him know that God and man witnesses against him." Our pious ancestors were for bobbing the hair for the good of the Colony; but now, sir, not the hair but the purses must be bobbed for the good of the State. The petitioners pray for the right of going to heaven in that way which they believe is the most direct, and shall this be denied them. Must they be obliged to pay legal toll for walking the King's highway, which has been made free for all?...Since the Revolution, all the old States, except two or three in New England, have established religious liberty upon its true bottom, and yet they are not sunk

The American Baptists

with earthquakes or destroyed with fire and brimstone. Should this commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, proceed so far as to distribute all settlements and meeting-houses, which were procured by public taxes among all the inhabitants, without regard to denomination, it is probable that the outcry of sacrilege, profanity and infidelity would be echoed around; and yet, sir, all this has been done in a State which has given birth and education to a Henry, a Washington, a Jefferson and a Madison, each of whom contributed their aid to effect the grand event...These petitioners, sir, pay the civil list, and arm to defend their country as readily as others, and only ask for the liberty of forming their societies and paying their preachers in the only way that the Christians did for the first three centuries after Christ. Any gentleman upon this floor is invited to produce an instance that Christian societies were ever formed, Christian Sabbaths ever enjoined, Christian salaries ever levied, or Christian worship ever enforced by law before the reign of Constantine. Yet, Christianity did stand and flourish, not only without the aid of the law and the schools, but in opposition to both. We hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the prayers of thirty thousand, on this occasion, will be heard, and that they will obtain the exemption for which they pray.'

But their prayers were not heard, and their most strenuous efforts at reform were unavailing, until the people arose in their might and so amended the Bill of Rights in 1833 that the Church and State were forever separated, since which time what Leland called 'the felonious principle' has been banished from the statute books of all the States, and, as Leland did not die until 1841, he breathed free air for the last seven years of his life, to his great health and delectation. He lived to be eighty-seven years of age, and deserved ten years of fresh air after he had labored sixty-seven years to vindicate the civil and religious rights of all men. Rest, royal old warrior, rest on the Cheshire hills, which thou didst so much to make free!

IN VERMONT the contest was neither so long nor so severe. The lands which now form Vermont were claimed in part by New Hampshire and in part by New York, and were originally known as the New Hampshire grants. Their inhabitants applied to the Continental Congress for admission into the confederacy in 1776, but, New York opposing, they withdrew. The next year they proclaimed themselves independent and formed a Constitution, and were admitted into the Union in 1791. Dr. Asaph Fletcher had removed from Massachusetts to Cavendish, Vermont, in 1787, and was a member of the Convention which applied for the admission of the State into the Union. He was also a member of the Convention of 1793 to revise the State Constitution, when he contended for the separation of Church and State, but the contrary idea prevailed. Such a vital subject could not long rest, however, especially with Dr. Fletcher in active service as a member of the Legislature, a Judge of the County Court, a member of the Council, and a State Presidential elector. In 1789, two years after Fletcher's settlement in Vermont, he was followed by Rev. Aaron Leland, from Bellingham, Mass. His liberal political sentiments soon commended him to his fellow-citizens, and he was elected to the General Assembly. There he served as Speaker of the House for three years, and for four years he was one of the Governor's Council. For five years, also, he was Lieutenant-Governor of the State, and for eighteen he was an Assistant Justice in the County Court. He had large influence amongst the Baptists of the State, as well as with its citizens generally, and in 1828 he declined a nomination for Governor, fearing that the office would interfere too much with his pastoral duties. He was a Fellow of Middlebury College, possessed great mental power, and was a very forcible debater. While he was Speaker of the

House a proposition came before it for a dissolution of Church and State, and in the discussion some one was weak enough to say that Christianity would go down if the State withdrew its support. This stirred all the fervor of his spirit. He left the chair and took part in the debate, delivering one of the strongest speeches ever heard in Vermont in favor of religious liberty, the main strength of his position being that God had founded his Church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against her.

A third Vermont Baptist champion of religious freedom is found in Ezra Butler, who, in 1785, removed from Claremont, N.H., to Waterbury, Vt., where, about 1800, he became a Baptist and formed a Church, which he served as pastor for more than thirty years. His talents and high character induced his fellow-citizens to intrust him with civil office, first as town clerk, justice of the peace, and then as member of the Legislature, also as Chief Justice for Washington County. In 1813-15 he served his State in Congress, and from 1826 to 1828 he was Governor of Vermont, with Aaron Leland as Lieutenant-Governor, both being Baptist ministers at the time. Under these great leaders and their compeers the public sentiment finally threw aside the union of Church and State in Vermont, distancing Massachusetts by a number of years in that race.

SOUTH CAROLINA Baptists stood firmly for religious liberty. The State formed its Constitution in 1776, and amended it in 1778 and 1790; but the Baptists were early awake to the need of securing their rights, and as early as 1779 the Charleston Association made it the duty of a standing committee to labor for the perfect equality of all religious people before the law, and for this purpose they were 'to treat with the government in behalf of the Churches.' No one contributed more to the result of civil and religious liberty in Georgia than did the

noted Richard Furman, D.D., of whom a brief sketch may here be given. He was born at Æsopus, N.Y., in 1755, but, while an infant, his parents removed to South Carolina and settled on the High Hills of Santee. Here, after a good early education, he became a Christian, and at the age of eighteen began to preach, with a remarkable degree of clearness, devotion and force, for a youth. The district where he labored lay to the east and north of the rivers Wateree and Santee, where wickedness abounded. He formed many Churches, which united with the Charleston Association. He was extremely modest, but his unassuming ardor, with his ripeness of judgment in interpreting Scripture, and His uncommon pungency of appeal awakened universal surprise and admiration. He was scarcely twenty-two when the Revolution commenced, and he avowed himself at once a firm Whig and threw all his powers into the American cause. When the British invaded South Carolina he was obliged to retire into North Carolina and Virginia, and afterwards Cornwallis put a price on his head. In Virginia he became intimate with Patrick Henry, who presented him with certain books, which are cherished in the Furman family to this day. In 1787 he accepted the pastoral charge of the Baptist Church in Charleston, where he remained for eight and thirty years, and became intimate with those patriot families, the Pinckneys, Rutledges and Sumpters, together with whom he labored earnestly for the Revolutionary cause. When independence was achieved, and the leading men of the State were selected to meet in convention and form a new Constitution, their suffrages made him a member of that body, in which he contended earnestly against the exclusion of Christian ministers from certain civil offices, and did much to secure soul-liberty in the State. So nobly had he blended his patriotism with the refinement and urbanity of a holy character,

The American Baptists

that on the death of Washington and Hamilton he was appointed by the Cincinnati and the Revolution Society to deliver orations in tribute to their memory.

Taken altogether, he was a most eminent servant of God and of his country. The late Dr. W.R. Williams said:

'Of this eminent servant of the Lord it is difficult to express what is just and proper without the appearance of excessive partiality. To represent him in the ordinary terms of eulogy, or to depict his virtues by any of the common standards of description, would be the direct way to fall short of the truth. The Providence of God gives few such men to the world as Dr. Furman...Where others were great he was transcendent, and where others were fair and consistent in character, he stood forth lovely and luminous in all the best attributes of man...In general learning he had made such progress as would have ranked him among men of the first intelligence in any country...His studies were chiefly confined to mathematics, metaphysics, belles-lettres, logic, history and theology. He cultivated also an acquaintance with the ancient classics, particularly Homer, Longinus and Quintillian, with whose beauties and precepts he was familiar. He read with sedulous attention all

the writers of the Augustan age of English literature, and whatever the language possessed valuable in criticism and immortal in poetry. There are few men, it is believed, who have had their minds more richly stored with the fine passages of Milton, Young, Pope, Addison, Butler and other great authors than Dr. Furman. From them he could quote properly, and appositely for almost every occasion, what was most beautiful and eloquent. He possessed uncommon talent in discerning the utility of these studies connected with the mind, and in condensing them into such abstracts as to make them clearly intelligible to every capacity. In this way he could analyze and expound the principles of moral philosophy and logic, with a facility which could only have resulted from a ready mastery over the subjects. But that which imparted a charm to his whole life was the godly savor which pervaded and sweetened all his superior endowments and qualifications. All the vigor of his noble intellect was consecrated to God. All the matured fruit of His long experience was an oblation to the Father of Mercies. All the variety of his acquirements, and all the vastness of his well-furnished mind, were merged in one prevailing determination to know nothing save Christ crucified.'

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

Scarcely had the Baptists adjusted themselves to their new circumstances in the American republic, when a fresh element was thrown into their life by enlarging their conceptions of duty to Christ both in sending the Gospel to foreign lands and in doubling their efforts to evangelize their own country. American Baptists were called to foreign mission work in 1814 on this wise. In 1812 Rev. Adoniram Judson and his wife, Ann Hasseltine Judson, with Rev. Luther Rice, were appointed by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to establish missions in Asia. Messrs. Judson and Rice sailed in different vessels to India, and on their voyage, without consultation with each other, they re-examined the New Testament teaching on baptism. The result was that they both adopted the views of the Baptists, and, in loyalty to God's word, when they reached Calcutta, they were immersed on a personal profession of their faith in Christ. At once they made this change known to the world, and were cut off from their former denominational support. Mr. Rice returned to the United States to awaken in the Baptist Churches a zeal for the establishment of missions in India, he was heartily welcomed, and measures were adopted for the temporary support of Mr. and Mrs. Judson. Mr. Rice traveled from Boston through the Middle and Southern States, and his addresses kindled a wide-spread enthusiasm, which resulted in the gathering of a convention, composed of thirty-six delegates from eleven States and the District of Columbia, who met in Philadelphia, May 18th, 1814, when a society was formed, called The Baptist General Convention for Foreign Missions. Dr. Furman, of South Carolina, was President of this body, Dr. Baldwin, of Massachusetts, Secretary, and Mr. and Mrs. Judson were adopted as its first missionaries.

Rev. Dr. Baldwin, of Boston, was also elected President of a Board which was to conduct the operations of the Convention, which office he filled till his death in 1825, and Drs. Holcomb and Rogers were elected Vice-Presidents. Mr. John Cauldwell was chosen as Treasurer, and Rev. Dr. Staughton as Corresponding Secretary. Mr. Rice was chosen

'To continue his itinerant services in these United States for a reasonable time, with a view to excite the public mind more generally to engage in missionary exertions and to assist in organizing societies and institutions for carrying the missionary design into execution.'

The Convention itself came to be known as the 'Triennial Convention,' from the fact that it met once in three years, and the Board of the Convention was located in Boston. Mr. Rice collected a considerable amount of money, and in 1815 Mr. Hough, of New Hampshire, and Miss White, of Philadelphia, were appointed missionaries. The first triennial session of the Convention was held in Philadelphia, May, 1817, when Dr. Furman was re-elected President; and Dr. Sharp, of Boston, Secretary. At this meeting the Convention enlarged its work by appropriating a portion of its funds to domestic missionary purposes, and also by determining 'to institute a classical and theological seminary' to train young men for the ministry, which measures, as we shall see, diverted the Convention considerably from the primary intention of its founders.

Meanwhile, Mr. and Mrs. Judson were driven by the intolerance of the government from Bengal and proceeded to Rangoon, to commence missionary work in Burma, where they arrived July 13th, 1813. Rangoon was the chief sea-port of Burma, and the most important center of Buddhism. A feeble attempt to establish a mission here had been made by a son of Dr. Carey, but it had been abandoned;

The American Baptists

and Mr. and Mrs. Judson found themselves in this heathen city, without an English-speaking helper, a grammar, a dictionary or a printed book. They began the study of the language, in which, twenty-one years later, Mr. Judson was able to lay the whole Bible, faithfully translated, before the Burman people. Mr. and Mrs. Judson celebrated the Lord's Supper alone in Rangoon, September 19th, 1813; but Mr. and Mrs. Hough joined them in October, 1816, and Messrs. Wheelock and Coleman in 1819. A zayat, or shed, for the preaching of the Gospel, was opened on the way-side in April, 1819. Though they had labored much privately, this was their first attempt at public worship. Their first congregation numbered fifteen, but was both inattentive and disorderly. Besides the Sabbath service, the missionaries used the zayat from morning till night every day in the week, to teach the way of salvation to all who came. The first convert, Mounge Nau, was baptized June 27th, 1819; two others were immersed in November of that year. As the laws of Burma made it a capital crime for a native to change his religion, Messrs. Judson and Coleman thought it prudent to visit the Emperor at the capital, that they might, if possible, secure toleration for the converts who had become Christians. They went up on this errand to Amarapura in December, carrying to the Emperor an elegant Bible in six volumes, enveloped, according to Burman taste, in a beautiful wrapper. A tract, also, was prepared and presented, containing a brief summary of Christianity. The Emperor read but two sentences of the tract and threw it from him in displeasure; he also declined to accept the Bible. The missionaries returned to Rangoon to report their failure to the converts, dreading its possible effect upon their minds; but, to their surprise, these remained steadfast to their profession, and begged their teachers to abide with them until there should be eight or ten

converts, at least. If then they should depart, one of the converts would be appointed to teach the rest, and so the new religion might spread itself.

Mr. Coleman went to Chittagong, a part of India which had been ceded to the English Crown, to provide a refuge for the converts in case they should be driven by persecution to seek the protection of the British government, and he died while on this mission of love. Mrs. Judson visited England, Scotland, and the United States and awakened a deep interest in the work. Mr. and Mrs. Wade joined the mission; but, just as prosperity began to dawn on the missionaries' labors, the first Burmese war broke out, suspending their operations for nearly three years, and subjecting them to the gravest apprehensions for their own lives. The Burmans did not understand the difference between Englishmen and Americans, and arrested indiscriminately every person wearing a hat. An executioner was placed over Messrs. Judson and Wade, who, with bent heads and bared necks, awaited the fatal blow, the order having been given that the Burman executioner should strike off their heads the moment that a British shot should be fired upon Rangoon. The shot was fired, but the executioner fled in terror, and the two men of God escaped. After this, Judson was confined in various prisons for two years and three months, the victim of agonizing sufferings. Meanwhile, his precious manuscript of the New Testament was for a season buried in the earth under a floor, and afterwards sewed up in an old pillow, which was tossed about from hand to hand till the close of the war, too hard to tempt the head of the poorest by the thought that it was worth destruction.

During the war a native preacher remained in Rangoon; yet the converts were scattered, and the pastor suffered scourging, the stocks and imprisonment, for the name of Christ. In a

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

short time after the war, however, the Church numbered twenty members, nearly all baptized by him. The terms of peace annexed a large portion of Burman territory to British India, and from that time the mission fell under British protection. Not far from this period the KARENS first received the Gospel. They had long been oppressed by their Burman neighbors, and lived hidden in the hills and forests. It was, therefore, a thrilling scene when thirty-four of that people were baptized by Mr. Mason, in the presence of Mr. Boardman, their apostle. Up to that time there had been but twenty-two converts in fifteen years including the capital of Burma, Amherst and Tavoy. At the close of this baptismal scene, the first-fruits of Mr. Boardman's labor amongst the Karens, his joyful spirit ascended to its rest. This people seemed ripe for the Gospel from the beginning, while the prouder Burman race have received the Gospel slowly, only about 1,200 having become members of our churches down to this date; about 30,000 Karens have become Christians, and are now gathered into Gospel churches. For the general convenience of our Burman missions, the printing department, the Karen College, and the Theological Seminary are located in Rangoon. Mr. Bennett first established the press and had charge of it for more than half a century, accomplishing incalculable good thereby to all Burma. The Karen College was opened in 1872, with seventeen students, under the Presidency of Ray, Dr. Binney, in buildings endowed by the late Professor Ruggles, of Washington. The Theological Seminary was established by Dr. Binney, in 1859, though instruction had been previously given, at different times and places, by Dr. Wade and others, to candidates for the ministry. Rev. D.A.W. Smith, D.D., has presided over the seminary since the death of Dr. Binney, aided by four native Karen teachers, educated men, prepared for their

office. It numbers about sixty students, and yearly graduates about one fourth of that number to preach to their own people. Dr. Smith has nearly finished a complete commentary of the Bible in Karen, and prepared and issued for the use of Karen students an elementary treatise on logic and Wayland's 'Elements of Moral Science,' and for several years he has put into Karen the 'International Sunday-School Lessons' for Karen Sabbath-schools. Besides superintending the Burman work in and around Rangoon, Dr. Stevens has instructed several Burman assistants. The first female convert in Burmah, Mah Menia, was baptized by torch-light, on the night of July 18th, 1820. Such has been the growth of the Burman missions that amongst the various peoples of the empire there are 98 missionaries, male and female, 118 ordained native preachers, and 25,371 members. The war of 1826 was followed by the death of the heroic Mrs. Judson, in Amherst, where she now sleeps in Jesus. After her death, her husband transferred most of his personal property to the missionary treasury.

MAULMAIN, the chief station of the British power in Burma, was thenceforward made the head-quarters of the mission. Work was begun there in 1827, between which time and September, 1828, twenty-one converts were baptized and a native Church was formed, numbering thirty members. In 1834 Dr. Judson completed the revision of the New Testament and finished the translation of the Old. A mission press was set up in Maulmain by Mr. Bennett in 1830, which was followed within a brief interval by three others. The printing of the Bible in four or five languages and dialects, besides tracts, school-books and other works, has kept the press – which in 1862 was transferred to Rangoon – constantly busy. Maulmain was the first seat of the Karen Theological Seminary and of Miss Haswell's

The American Baptists

school for native girls, established in 1867; which in five years numbered 103 pupils. Here also Dr. Haswell translated the New Testament into Peguan, and here he rests in hope of a blessed resurrection. A Baptist Church was formed here, in connection with the British army, and many English soldiers became the disciples of Christ. The native Christians are well trained in the art of giving for religious purposes. In seven years they gave over \$5,000 in gold for the support of the Gospel and mission schools. In connection with the station at Maulmain there were reported in 1886 about twenty Churches and more than 1,100 members.

Dr. Judson did His last work at Maulmain. He had spent ten years at Rangoon, two at Ava, and a brief time at Amherst, after which he removed to Maulmain and continued there to the close of life, chiefly pursuing the work of translation; though he kept the oversight of the Burmese Church there. The last leaf of his translation of the Scriptures was finished on January 31st, 1831, and he put his revised translation to press in 1810. When His health became thoroughly broken, he left this place under the advice of his physician, on board the French bark *Aristide Marie*, bound for the Island of Bourbon, in the hope that the voyage might prolong his life. But nine days after his embarkment, when scarcely three days out of sight of the Burmese mountains, he began to sink rapidly. All that love and skill could do for him were done, but at fifteen minutes past four o'clock P.M., on the 12th of April, 1850, he passed to the bosom of Jesus, as peacefully as a child would drop asleep in its mother's arms. At eight o'clock the same evening, the crew, his two broken-hearted Burman assistants and Mr. Ranney assembled on the larboard part of the ship, and in reverent silence committed his body to the keeping of the Indian Ocean. No eye now rests upon the spot that closed over

him but that of the true God. In latitude 13 degrees north, longitude 93 degrees east, God found a grave for one of His noblest sons on this globe. None can drop a tear or raise a shaft there, but His eternal monument lives in redeemed Burma. She glorifies God in him who to her was made the savor of life unto life.

TAVOY was the third of the Burman missions: its establishment being due to a suggestion of the first native Burman preacher, who proposed to make a missionary journey there in 1827. Here that great work amongst the Karens commenced; here the first Karen preacher was baptized, and near Tavoy Mr. Mason performed his first official act as a missionary in baptizing thirty-four Karens. It is nearly two hundred miles distant from Maulmain and thirty-five miles from the sea, on Tavoy River. Its population at the opening of the mission, April 18th, 1828, was about 6,000; it is in British Burma and a stronghold, of idolatry. Two converts soon formed the nucleus of the Church, and a missionary spirit possessed the converts, who visited many villages far and near with the word of life. The Karens of the vicinity held a tradition that at some time messengers from the West would bring to them a revelation from God. Hence, they were prepared to receive our missionaries with open arms and to accept their message. The printing-press was located at Tavoy for some time, and a chapel was built in the town, not far from the grave of Boardman. The Karen Church in the town is weak, but many Churches exist in the forest and jungle, some miles away. Mr. Morrow is the faithful missionary to the Karens there, and his wife, an educated physician, is his efficient helper. The Tavoy Association numbers 23 Churches, 950 members, 11 ordained and 10 unordained preachers, and 13 schools.

The second war between Burma and Great Britain, 1852, was brief, but had an important

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

influence on the missionary work. It resulted in the annexation of a large portion of Southern Burma to the British realm in India, which opened a wider field for preaching and relieved the converts from the fear of persecution by a heathen government; our mission in Burma, therefore, took a sudden expansion. New stations were commenced in Tonngoo, on the Sitang River, Henthada, and other places, and many triumphs crowned the labors of our brethren. Toungoo, one of the new stations, opened by Dr. Mason in 1853, was one of the most fruitful in converts. The zeal of Sail Quala, a native preacher, was awakened through a man from Toungoo, who had been converted three years previously. The second day after the beginning of the mission, a hundred Burmans called on Dr. Mason to inquire about the new religion, and in a few weeks found several disciples. Ill health compelled Dr. Mason to leave for the United States for a time; but the mission, left in charge of San Quala, seemed to be blessed with a new Pentecost. Active, faithful, wise and energetic, this native preacher took a broad field, planned prudently, superintended efficiently, and commended himself to all by his self-denying labors. In the first year of the mission 741 were baptized. Within a year and nine months he had administered the ordinance to 1,860 converts and formed 28 churches, while hundreds of converts were still waiting to be baptized. In 1856 zayats were erected in forty villages, where the people had renounced idolatry, and ten native preachers in the district were supported by the Maulmain Missionary Society. In a single month of 1857 Mr. Whitaker baptized 233 converts; two Associations were organized, and various Karen tribes were brought under Christian influences.

Dr. Mason died in 1874. Mr. Bunker, Mr. Eveleth, Dr. Cross and others, had in the meantime, joined the station. Dr. Mason had

translated the whole Bible into Sgail Karen, and later, Mr. Brayton translated it into Pwo Karen. Dr. Mason, being a man of scientific tendencies, contributed largely to the knowledge of natural history in the Burman empire. The mission in and about Toungoo numbers 102 native preachers, 110 Churches, and 3,869 members. From this point the mission to the Shans began, and the Bible has been translated into Shan by Dr. Gushing. The statistics of 1886 give 144 churches, 4,788 members, and 84 native preachers.

HENTHADA was opened as a mission station after the war of 1852. Mr. Thomas was the first missionary to the Karens of this mission, and Mr. Crawley to the Burmans. At first many of the natives, attracted by curiosity, thronged as visitors to the missionaries, who, after the Gospel was introduced, became zealous converts; for at the end of the first year the Karen department reported 8 churches and 150 members. At the end of ten years, the mission reported 751 Burman converts and five preachers. Mr. Thomas instructed a class of twenty or more native helpers every year, during the rains, and kept the charge of his field twelve or thirteen years, traveling in every part of his district, preaching and baptizing constantly, enjoying almost a perpetual revival. At length, broken in health, for a time he changed his field for that of Bassein, and Mr. Smith took the post at Henthada. In a short time Mr. Thomas was compelled to return to the United States, where he died on the day after his arrival. His widow returned to Henthada, where she efficiently continued the work which her husband had begun; their son, Williston, joined his mother in 1880, and is still toiling in a spirit worthy of his parents.

ARRACAN, on the western coast of Burma, became a mission station in 1835, and, at different times, thirteen missionaries and their wives labored there with much success. A

chain of mountains, parallel with the coast, divided Burma Proper from the territory which had been ceded to Great Britain. In many instances, the converts on the Burman frontier, having embraced Christianity, crossed the mountains into English territory, and being baptized, returned, to live a Christian life amongst their fellow-countrymen. The work prospered and multitudes believed. The names of Abbott, Comstock, Stilson, Ingalls and others, are a memorial in this mission. All of them passed away early, and the Arracan Mission disappeared; but out of it grew the mission in Bassein, one of the fairest portions of the Christian heritage in Burma. It has become one of the great centers of evangelical labor amongst the Karens. In 1872, a Burman preacher, supported almost wholly by native contributions, visited 540 houses, conversed on religious themes with 1,397 persons, and distributed 600 or 700 tracts. As early as 1848, there were 36 teachers and more than 400 pupils in the schools of the Karen department. Day-schools existed in nearly every village, and the native Christians sustained the preaching of the Gospel in their own neighborhoods. The plan of self-support has been effectively developed, and native Christians have contributed much to send the Gospel to others. A memorial hall, serving the double purpose of a place of worship and for higher education, spacious and provided with every facility, was dedicated at Bassein in 1878, on the fiftieth anniversary of the baptism of the first Karen convert. This building was paid for mainly by the liberality of the native Christians. In 1886 there were 99 churches, 8,490 members, and 97 native preachers.

PROME has ever been a scene of missionary interest, on account of the visit paid to that city by Dr. Judson in 1830, although for twenty-four years after that visit no missionary returned there. But the work was again taken up

by Messrs. Kincaid and Simons, and still later by Mr. E.O. Stevens, son of the veteran missionary in Rangoon, and it has yielded good fruit. Four Churches connected with the mission are self-supporting, and there are now 11 native preachers, 4 churches, and 241 members. Many other stations in Burma have missionaries and native preachers, churches and schools, and are fully organized for Christian work. Thongzai, an exclusively Burman station, is remarkable for the labor of Mrs. Ingalls and a female associate, who have stood firmly at their post for many years. She has won the confidence and affections of the converts and of the heathen, and is held in high esteem by travelers of all ranks; for the railroad, extending between Rangoon and Prome, passes directly through Thongzai. In 1877 Bhamo became a station of the Missionary Union, and since the absorption of Burma proper into British India, Mandalay, the capital, is also occupied by that body. All upper Burma is now included in the territory cultivated by the American Baptists. A recent enterprise has been entered upon in a station amongst the Karens at Chienginaï, in northern Siam.

ASSAM was opened as a mission in 1836 by Messrs. Nathan Brown and O.T. Cutter, who had been previously stationed in Burma. The first station of the mission was Sadiya, 400 miles north of Ava, and about 200 from Yunnan, on the borders of China. But about a dozen stations are now occupied, mostly on the south side of the Brahmaputra, and are accessible by British steamers. A printing-press was established by Mr. Cutter, and the translation of the New Testament into Assamese was begun by Dr. Brown, Jan. 1, 1838. Mr. Bronson undertook to open a mission amongst the Nagas, in their hills, but on account of the insalubrity of the climate he changed his residence to Nowgong, where he baptized the first Assamese convert, June 13,

1841. The Nowgong Orphan Institution was for several years a fruitful part of the mission work, for in it many were converted and trained for usefulness. The school was dispersed after twelve years, but more native helpers were brought out of this school than from any other source. Other stations were occupied in succession by new missionaries, Messrs. Ward, Whiting, Danforth and others, whose labors were crowned by abundant blessings. In 1851 the second edition of the New Testament was issued, and revivals of religion, with large additions to the Churches, followed. In 1857, at the time of the Indian mutiny, much apprehension was felt; but the storm passed, and not a hair of the head of any missionary was touched.

The GAROS were first visited in 1857, and that movement opened one of the brightest chapters in the history of the mission to Assam. A torn tract, swept out of a building which had been cleaned and prepared for a new tenant, was picked up by a Sepoy guard and read. It led to his conversion; he became an efficient preacher to his tribe, and in 1867, a Church was formed amongst them, numbering 40 members. The next year the number increased to 81, and in 1869 to 140; from these sprang 5 native churches, 8 native preachers, and a formal School. The mission has conveyed the Gospel to tribe after tribe in the hills and on the plains adjoining the Brahmaputra. Two Assamese native preachers and one Garo have visited the United States, and the latter, who had learned English, spent a year in the Newton Theological Institution. The statistics of 1886 show, 30 churches, 1,889 members, and 27 native preachers, with 7 stations and 21 missionaries, male and female. The stations of the Assam Mission are divided into three Assam, three Naga, and one Garo, amongst which there are 72 schools and 1,229 pupils.

SIAM was the second mission undertaken

by American Baptists amongst the heathen inhabitants of Asia. Rev. John Taylor Jones was the first missionary, he had labored about two years in Burma, and had become so proficient in that language as to preach to the natives in their own tongue. He reached Bangkok in March, 1833, and the first converts were baptized in December of that year. They were all Chinese, which race form the majority of the people of that city. Dr. Jones translated the New Testament into Siamese and made much progress in preparing a Dictionary of the language, a grammar and other works. Mrs. Jones prepared a Catechism of the Christian religion. From the mission-press in Bangkok, much Christian literature was scattered abroad. Dr. Dean joined the mission in 1834; and devoted himself to the Chinese department; left Siam in 1842, and returned to Bangkok in 1864. In August, 1835, he preached his first sermon to 34 natives, and in 1841, formed a class of Chinese preachers, which he continued till he left for Hong Kong. Mr. J.H. Chandler joined the mission in 1843. He was not a preacher, but possessed remarkable mechanical skill, and largely through his influence the king became one of the most progressive native rulers of Asia. In the palace is a working printing-press, and one or more steamboats belonging to the government ply in the river before Bangkok.

During the next ten years Messrs. Davenport, Goddard, Jencks and Ashmore, with their wives, joined the mission, and Miss Harriet H. Morse, the latter to labor in the Siamese department, the others in the Chinese. Dr. Jones died in 1851. A decree was issued tolerating Christian worship, and by authority of the king the ladies of the mission were invited to the palace daily to teach the court ladies English. After the death of Dr. Jones, the Siamese work was continued by Mr. S.J. Smith, who, with his wife, has remained until this date, to superintend a school, to prepare and

distribute tracts and to teach the people the knowledge of the true God. Mr. Smith supports himself and his work by secular employment. Messrs. Lisle, Partridge and Chilcott and Miss Fielde have labored in the Chinese department. In the year 1874 there were large additions to the number of converts, two new Churches were formed and two native pastors ordained. Eleven were baptized at one station, seventeen at another, twenty-five at a third, and eighty-four at a fourth. In 1877 there were six churches, 418 members, and sixty-one were baptized during the year. Dr. Jones labored in Bangkok eighteen years, Dr. Dean more than twenty-five, Messrs. Davenport and Telford, nine years each; Dr. Ashmore and Miss Morse, seven years each; Miss Fielde six years, Mr. Partridge four, and Mr. Chilcott one. About thirty missionaries have been connected with this mission. Its latest statistics report five churches and one hundred members. Many of those who have been baptized, being but temporary residents of Siam, have returned to China and been numbered with the disciples of Christ there.

THE TELUGUS. This Indian mission has been amongst the most successful and renowned in modern times. The Telugu nation numbers about 18,000,000, residing mainly in India, west of the Bay of Bengal, and between Calcutta on the north and Madras on the south. The mission was commenced in 1836, by Messrs. Day and Van Husen. Its jubilee was celebrated with great joy at Nellore, in February, 1886. The 'Lone Star,' as it has been often called, has expanded into a constellation. For the first twenty years the work was discouraging and many proposed to abandon it, but a few pleaded for its continuance and prevailed. The first permanent station of the mission was Nellore. Rev. Mr. Jewett joined the mission in April, 1849, and preached his first sermon in Telugu in December, eight months

after his arrival. At the close of 1852 he and his wife, with two or three native Christians, visited Ongole, and, before leaving the place, they ascended a slope of ground overlooking this village, since named 'Prayer-meeting Hill,' and while kneeling together there, prayed that a missionary might be sent to Ongole. In the meantime the work of preaching, teaching and tract distribution was continued, and a few converts were gathered as the first-fruits of these efforts. In 1858 several were added to the Church, and twelve years after the prayers on Prayer-meeting Hill, Rev. J.E. Clough formed the mission and planted his standard at Ongole. On the 1st of June, 1867, eight members formed a church at Ongole. Divine influences have been wonderfully shed abroad amongst this people. After the Week of Prayer; in the beginning of January, five days were spent in a tent-meeting devoted to reading the Scriptures, prayer and preaching; at the close twenty-eight asked for baptism. In 1868 when Mr. Timpany joined the mission, twenty-three were baptized in Xellore and sixty-eight in Ongole. More than eighty villages, in a circuit of forty miles around Ongole, had heard the word of life. Mr. McLanrin came to the help of the missionaries in 1870, when 1,000 villages had heard the Gospel. This year a Church was organized in Ramapatam, and the number of baptisms reported for the year was 915. The Theological Seminary for native preachers, was opened here in 1872, with eighteen students, a body that has increased to more than 200 members. Mr. Downie arrived in 1873, and Mr. Campbell in 1874. Then came a year of famine, a year of cholera, and still another of famine. During these years the government came to the help of the perishing people by employing them in digging canals for the development of the country. Mr. Clough took contracts for certain portions of this work, and paid good wages to the starving natives of his district, and while

they labored for their bread, his native preachers laid before them the Gospel. Many asked for baptism, but he refused to baptize any while the famine lasted lest they should profess Christianity from wrong motives. When the three years of pestilence and famine were over, he offered baptism to all true believers. In one day 2,222 were immersed upon the profession of their faith. He detailed the process to the writer with great care, stating that there were six administrators; three of them immersing at a time, as the candidates were brought to them into the water, and when they became weary the three rested while the others proceeded with the baptisms. Everything, he said, was done with perfect deliberation, the Gospel formula was carefully pronounced over each candidate before his burial; that he stood by and superintended the administration, but baptized none himself, and that only about eight hours were passed in the great baptism. From June to September, 9,147 were immersed, and the numbers increased until 17,000 had been immersed on their profession of faith in Christ. The church register in Ongole alone contained, in 1881, more than 16,000 names. During the first half of the year 1881, 1,669 were baptized, and from June, 1878, to June, 1881, the total number reached 16,846. For years the native preachers had faithfully preached throughout the district, and the American missionaries were delighted to see them thus honored of God in their labors. The Ongole Church having become the largest in the world, the multitude was organized into fourteen Churches for convenience. The whole number of members reported in 1886 is 26,389, the church at Ongole still numbering 14,890. In the mission, at the same date, there were 287 stations, 40 missionaries, male and female, 160 native preachers, 46 churches, 292 schools, and 4,270 pupils.

CHINA. The Missionary Union has two

missions in the empire of China, the Southern and the Eastern. Mr. Shuck and Mr. Roberts founded the Southern mission, being followed by Dr. William Dean, who readied Hong Kong in 1842. Mr. Lord readied Ningpoo in June, 1847, and Mr. Goddard went from Bangkok to Ningpoo in 1849. There was a temporary station at Macao, where the first Chinese convert of the mission was baptized. A chapel was built in Victoria and another in Chekdiee. Thirty-three services were held every week in Chinese, and in 1844 nineteen were baptized. In 1848 Mr. Johnson joined the mission, and in that year 20,000 tracts were distributed; also, Dr. Dean's 'notes on the Gospel of Matthew and the Book of Genesis.' Mr. Ashmore joined the mission in 1858, and in 1861 the seat of the mission was transferred to Swatow. The Church there numbered thirty members in 1863, but suffered great persecution. A literary graduate, however, confessed Christ; two Chinese preachers were ordained in 1867 and became pastors of churches. Miss Fielde and Mr. Partridge were transferred to Swatow; the former prepared a synopsis of the Gospels in Chinese and a dictionary of the Swatow dialect. In 1876 forty-nine were baptized, and the next year 169, making the number of members 512. Mr. McKibben labored largely amongst the hill tribes, answering to the Karens in Burma; the statistics of 1886 give 36 out-stations, 1,433 members, 36 native preachers, 14 missionaries, 11 schools, and 175 pupils.

NINGPO, or the Eastern China mission, has its principal station at Ningpo. It has been occupied from 1843, when Dr. Maegowan opened a hospital. In eight months of the next year 2,139 cases were treated. A chapel was opened in 1846, and a congregation of from eighty to one hundred attended, some also being baptized. In 1853, Mr. Goddard, who had joined the mission at Ningpo, completed an independent version of the New Testament,

pronounced by competent judges the best Chinese version that has been made. Mr. Knowlton joined the mission in 1855, and various outlying stations were established, so that, in 1859, nineteen were baptized, two of them literary-men, and an unusual number of females. Two women became Bible-readers, and the Church at Ningpo supported its own pastor. Five young Chinamen became candidates for the ministry, and in December, 1872, the first Baptist Chinese Association was formed there, numbering six Churches, twenty-three delegates being present, members of Churches 219, and native preachers fifteen. Dr. Barchet re-established the medical work in 1877, and Mr. Jenkins issued a Reference Testament. Sometimes sixty cases of disease were treated in a day, and many of the pupils were able to recite, word for word, the whole books of Genesis and Matthew. At this time, 1886, the Churches of the Eastern China mission number seven; members 246, native preachers thirteen, Bible-women four, schools six, pupils 184.

JAPAN. This mission was commenced by the appointment of Dr. Nathan Brown, once missionary to Assam, in May, 1872. He arrived on his field in February, 1873. Japan was just awakening from the slumber of centuries, and its persecuting edicts against Christianity were, about that time abandoned by imperial proclamation. Mr. Arthur and wife joined the mission in October, and, while studying the language, found numbers of young men who had forsaken the gods and were ready to listen to the Gospel. A Church of eight members was formed at Yokohama in 1873. Mr. Arthur stationed himself at Tokio, the capital, and several Buddhist priests offered him quarters in one of their temples. A Scripture Manual in Japanese was prepared by Dr. Brown, for the use of schools, and put in circulation. The first baptism in Tokio was in October, 1875. At

Yokohama a daily Bible class was established and a Sabbath-school; a native preacher labored, and by 1876 the Church numbered twenty-two members, while at Tokio, the same year, the Church had thirty-six members. Mr. Arthur died in 1877. Within three years the mission printed more than 3,000,000 pages of Scriptures and tracts, and the first Gospel ever printed in Japan was printed at the Baptist mission press. In 1878 twenty-eight converts were added to the two Churches, and Dr. Brown's translation of the New Testament was issued in 1879. Dr. Brown was one of the loveliest men ever known to the writer, and one of the best scholars. Before his death, in 1886, he translated the New Testament into the language of two heathen peoples: the Assamese and the Japanese. A Catechism of forty-eight pages, by Mr. Arthur, remains as a precious memorial of his literary labors for the Japanese. Rev. Thomas Poate joined the mission in December, 1879. He was formerly a teacher in the Imperial College of Japan. In a journey to the north he found the Japanese remarkably open to Christianity, and during 1880 baptized twenty-six and organized three Churches in that part of the empire. In 1886 there were five stations, four Churches, 409 members, fifteen native preachers and 215 pupils in schools.

AFRICA. The mission to the continent of Africa was commenced almost simultaneously with that in Burma, and several devoted missionaries sacrificed their lives in that inhospitable climate. The mission, begun in Monrovia, Liberia, was continued with indifferent success and under many discouragements, until 1856. The labors of Messrs. Lott Carey (colored), Skinner and others, were amongst Africans restored to their own country from America, and the Bassa tribe in the vicinity. Mr. Clarke, one of the missionaries, prepared a dictionary of the Bassa language, and nine Bassa young men were

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

converted. One native came to the United States, was baptized here, learned the printer's trade, and was about to return to his own people when he died. So many of the missionaries died after a brief period on the field that the mission was suspended in 1856; in 1868, the work was renewed, and Robert Hill (colored) appointed a missionary; he never reached his field. In 1869-70, 153 were baptized, and the mission reported 218 converts; in 1871 two Churches were organized and a place of worship dedicated. Two years afterwards, 19 Bassas cast off idolatry and embraced Christ, but aside from several heroic Bible-readers, who were on the field in 1880, the work is in a languishing state, in the absence of trained missionaries.

THE CONGO MISSION, in Central Africa, was first sustained by Mr. and Mrs. Guinness, of London, and much money was expended, largely out of their own possessions, in buildings and the maintenance of a steam-boat to ply on the river Congo and its branches, with other provisions for prosecuting mission work. They proposed to turn over to the American Baptists all the mission property in the Congo country, including land, buildings, the steam-boat and the missionary force, on condition that the work be carried forward on the principles of the Missionary Union. In 1885 this proffer was accepted, and the work undertaken. On grounds of expediency, some of the stations were transferred to another society laboring near them, and arrangements were made to bring the work into line with the general methods of work pursued by the Union. In 1886 five stations were reported, thirteen male missionaries, of whom three are married, and two single women. One missionary and wife have been sent from the United States, and two colored missionaries will soon be added to the force. At present, this noble enterprise is in its infancy, and although several converts have been baptized, the fruits of the mission have

been largely the anticipation of prayerful hope until very recently. Intelligence is received that a powerful work of grace is in progress at Banza Manteka, where more than 1,000 converts have been baptized, two of the king's sons being amongst them. At Mukimbungu about 30 have been converted, and the work of God is spreading in various directions.

EUROPEAN MISSIONS. Efforts to establish missions in Europe have been put forth by American Baptists. In France in 1832, in Germany and adjacent countries in 1834, in Greece 1836, in Sweden 1866, and in Spain 1870. Some of these efforts have met with but limited success, while others have been very largely blessed. The mission was commenced in France by Messrs. Wilmarth and Sheldon. Mr. Rostan, a native Frenchman, had previously made explorations, which awakened hope for the success of the undertaking. In May, 1835, a Baptist Church was organized in Paris, and later, Mr. Willard instructed a few young men in studies preparatory to the ministry. Messrs. Wilmarth and Willard returned to this country, and the work in Paris was left mainly in the hands of native ministers. From 1840 to 1872 the Church there struggled hard for existence. In the last of these years a costly chapel was built in the Rue de Lille, in which the Church still worships. There are also several small Churches in other parts of France, so that, as nearly as can be ascertained, there are 13 native Baptists laborers in France, male and female, with about 770 communicants.

GERMANY. Hase, the Church historian, pronounces the German Baptists 'after the American type of Christianity,' and Mr. Oncken, their apostle, demands notice here as, under God, their honored founder. He was born at Varel, in the Duchy of Oldenburg, Jan. 26th, 1800, and while young went to England, where he became a Christian. In 1823 he accepted an appointment from the British Continental

Society as a missionary to Germany. He preached on the shores of the German Ocean, chiefly in Hamburg and Bremen, till 1828, when he took an agency for the Edinburgh Bible Society; being, meanwhile, a member of the English Independent Church at Hamburg, under the pastoral care of Mr. Matthews. In the winter of 1830-31, Captain Tubbs, master of the brig Mars, and a member of the Sansom Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia, found his vessel ice-bound at Hamburg, and while detained there made his home in the family of Mr. Oncken. During his stay, Tubbs and Oncken spent much of their time in examining the New Testament, and the captain explained to him the doctrines and practices of the American Baptist Churches. Oncken was convinced that these Churches were modeled after the Gospel pattern, and expressed his wish to be immersed on his faith in Christ. When Captain Tubbs returned to Philadelphia, he reported these things to Dr. Dagg, his pastor, and to Dr. Cone, of New York. In 1833 Prof. Barnas Sears, of the Theological Institution at Hamilton, went to Germany to prosecute certain studies, and while there fell in with Mr. Oncken and six others who had embraced the same views, and on April 2nd, 1834, immersed the seven in the River Elbe at Altona, near Hamburg, and on the 23d they were organized into a Baptist Church with Mr. Oncken for pastor. When this became known, there was no small stir in Hamburg. The Established Church, Lutheran, was in arms at once; and the old 'Anabaptist' skeleton was brought out from the cupboard promptly, the upper room where the little band worshiped was surrounded by a mob, its doors and windows broken, and Oncken was dragged before the magistrates and thrust into prison. This at once gave flame to the movement throughout all Germany; the clergy raged, the mob threatened, and the magistrate punished, but it all amounted to nothing. For a

time, they were driven from place to place, and Oncken says that his citations to appear before the police averaged about one a week for a time, but 'the threats only gave me a greater impulse.' He was fined as well as imprisoned, his goods were seized, and he says: 'It happened that the Senator Hudtwalker, who, at that time, stood at the head of the police, was an esteemed Christian, who, although no Baptist, considered my religious activity as fraught with blessing...He was pressed hard to proceed against us, but he was not able to reconcile with his conscience the persecution of Christ in his members.' Mr. Oncken detailed to the writer, in his own house at Altona, some of the arguments by which he moved this chief of police. One was so novel that it must be repeated here. He said: 'Mr. Senator, the law of Hamburg provides that no lewd woman of the city can ply her wicked calling until she brings a certificate to the authorities, from the clergyman of her parish, stating that she was baptized in infancy, and is now a communicant in good standing in the State Church; then a license is given to her, to protect her from all harm in her wickedness. But if we persuade her to renounce her evil life and turn to Christ, and baptize her for the remission of her sins, as Peter taught at Pentecost, we are thrust into prison with the penitent woman for the crime of saving her!' This argument had weight with Hudtwalker. But says Oncken:

'His successor in office (who, however, afterwards became our friend, and has shown us much kindness), declared to me, at that time, that he would make every effort to exterminate us. When I reminded him that no religious movement could be suppressed by force, and said to him, "Mr. Senator, you will find that all your trouble and labor will be in vain," he answered: "Well, then, it will not be my fault, for as long as I can move my little finger I shall continue to move against you. If you wish to go to America, I will give you,

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

together with your wife and children, a free passage; but here, such sectarianism will not be endured."

This state of things continued for years, but the word of God prevailed, and the work of grace spread all through the German States; and from Hamburg it has spread to Prussia, Denmark, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Russia and Turkey. Within a little more than four years from its commencement, there were 4 churches and 120 members under Oncken's direction. In 1844 he had sent forth 17 preachers, organized 26 Churches, and their communicants numbered 1,500 members. The true prosperity of the mission, however, only began to be felt after the great Hamburg fire of 1848. At that date the Baptists had control of a large warehouse in the city, three stories high, where they received and distributed food and raiment amongst, and gave shelter to, the homeless poor. Here many were saved from death, and for the first time heard the Gospel, and the Government felt itself a debtor to those whom it had persecuted. In May, 1853, Mr. Oncken visited the United States and remained for fifteen months. Out of 70 Churches in Germany, only 8 had regular chapels built for the worship of God, and the American Churches aided them in erecting a number, \$8,000 a year being promised to him for five years. During the last twenty-six years, the Hamburg Church has had additions yearly, the smallest number being 5, and the largest 121, making a total of 1,317, an average of nearly one every Sabbath for the entire period. The largest Church connected with the Mission in 1867 was at Memel, In Eastern Prussia, numbering 1,524. Two missions were supported by the German Churches at this time, one in China and another in South Africa, and still later, one in the region of Mount Ararat, besides a number which they planted in the United States and South America. The Theological

School at Hamburg, having a four-years' course of study, is a constant source of supply for the ministry, twenty students having graduated therefrom in 1886. The Churches are gathered into Associations, and the Associations into a Triennial Conference. The Churches within the territory of Russia, which have sprung chiefly from the German Churches whose preachers have traveled into Switzerland, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania and Siberia, have recently formed the 'Union of Baptist Churches in the Russian Empire.' Dissent from the Greek Church in Russia is relentlessly crushed out, yet in many places little bands of Baptists have sprung up numbering in all about 12,000 persons. Itinerant missionaries in many provinces, such as Esthenia, are successfully winning men to Christ. In St. Petersburg, Mr. Schiewe has gathered crowds of people in his own house, until the authorities have forbidden their further assembling on the pretense of danger to health. Within two years he has baptized above four hundred converts there and elsewhere. But these men of God pay a great price for the privilege of saving their fellow Russians. One of them has been imprisoned more than forty times for preaching the Gospel. An old man of seventy years was put in chains and compelled to walk sixty English miles for this crime, the blood running from his ankles and wrists. In one town the preacher and all who listened to him were imprisoned, and few Baptist preachers in Russia have escaped the prison. Mr. Schiewe says:

"I, also, have not been free from it, having been imprisoned seven times for the Gospel's sake, and was forbidden the country for the same reason. In the year 1869 I was imprisoned for the first time; during the year 1872 five times, and in the year 1877 I was taken away by the police from my brethren and from my wife and children, and, together with five other brethren, was conducted over

The American Baptists

the frontier by guards armed with revolvers and side-arms, and banished into exile.'

The amount contributed by the Missionary Union in 1885, in behalf of the German Mission, was only \$5,400, and no American missionary has ever been engaged in the work in Germany. The statistics of this mission, in 1886, give 162 Churches, 152 chapels, and 32,244 members. Thus, in love, is God avenging the blood of the old German Baptist martyrs.

SWEDES. As the German mission was an outgrowth of a Baptist Church in Philadelphia, through the captain of a sea-going vessel, so the Swedish mission was directly the outcome of the Mariners' Church in New York, through a common sailor. This Church for Seamen had been recognized as a regular Baptist Church by a Council of Churches, December 4th, 1843, and Rev. Ira. B. Steward became its pastor. About two years after, Mr. Isaac T. Smith, one of its members, found a Danish sailor at the Sailors' Home, and brought him to the service of this Church. The man became interested, and came again about a year after, walking with a crutch, for he had then lost a leg. After lying in the hospital in Charleston, S.C., he had debated on the choice of returning to his home in Denmark, or to New York, but decided on the latter course. After his baptism, his brethren procured for him an artificial leg, thus enabling him to walk easily, he soon manifested great zeal in missionary work. In 1848 he was licensed to preach, and soon the ladies of the Bethel Union sent him as their missionary to Denmark. There, meeting another sailor who had lost a leg, he constructed one for him like his own artificial limb, and his fame soon spread amongst the wounded and crippled of the navy. The king sent for him and offered to set him up in that business in Copenhagen, if he would cease preaching and furnish legs for the disabled of the royal navy. But F.L. Rymker,

for this was his name, concluding that it was better for his brethren that they should enter into life maimed, determined to preach; which he continued to do in Denmark for seven or eight years, when he went to labor in the north of Norway. The result of about ten years' labor there was the formation of five or six churches, the ordination of two preachers, the employment of five unordained, and the conversion and baptism of between one hundred and fifty and two hundred Norwegians, scattered over a territory of two hundred miles in length. This was the condition of things there in 1868.

Right here we begin to trace the origin of the Swedish Mission to the same Church. Not long after Rymker had united with this body, Gustavus W. Schroeder, a young Swedish sailor who had just landed at the wharf in New York, came to the meeting on a Sabbath morning. He had been converted on his voyage and intended to unite with the Methodist Church, but another sailor invited him to attend the service with him that day at the Baptist Bethel. During the service Mr. Steward immersed two converted sailors on their faith in Christ. This was the first time that young Schroeder had seen the ordinance, and he was deeply affected, and said: 'his is the way that the Lord Jesus, who redeemed me with his blood, was baptized, and now, it would be ungrateful for me not to follow him.' This decided the matter; he, too, was immersed, and soon after sailed for Grottenburg, Sweden. There he fell in with Rev. Frederick O. Nelson, a Methodist missionary of the Seamen's Friend Society, who must here tell his own story. He says, that through the instrumentality of

'The dear brother Schroeder, the Lord has been pleased to awaken a spirit of inquiry in my mind on the subject of Baptism and the ordinances of God's house. The result of the inquiry has been that, after a long and sore

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

conflict with myself, I have at last been obliged to submit to and receive the truth. I was baptized in July, 1847, by the Rev. Mr. Oncken, in Hamburg; and on the 9th of September, this year, my wife and four others were baptized by a Danish brother by the name of Foster, a missionary of the Baptists in England. Thus the Lord has been pleased to commence a Church on New Testament principles even here in Sweden, the spiritual Spain of the North... We expect great trials and suffering for our principles; and we have had thoughts of leaving the country, but our consciences would not suffer us, till we were driven out by the authorities... If we are punished according to an existing law, it is a question if we do not suffer death.'

Again, under date of March 5th, 1848, Nelson writes:

'We have now twenty-eight Baptists! mind, twenty-eight *Baptist believers* in Sweden. Two years ago, as I and my wife were talking about Baptist principles, we said to one another; "Yes, it is right; if the Bible is true, the Baptist principles are the only Apostolic, the only true ones; but no one in Sweden will ever embrace them besides ourselves... Just as we were about in good earnest to prepare for emigration to America, some persons began to inquire, and to listen to our reasoning from the New Testament, for as yet we have had nothing but the Holy Scriptures by which to convince people. We are, however, not all in one place. In Gottenburg there are four brethren and two sisters. In another place, thirty-six English miles from town, there are three brethren and six sisters; about eighteen miles from there, are six brethren and seven sisters; making altogether twenty-eight." Ten days later he wrote, that he had baptized another 'in the sea;' but on the 24th of April he says: 'The truth has begun its course and is making disturbance in the enemy's camp. We are now thirty-five Baptists in Sweden,' and some of his brethren had been arrested because they refused to have their children christened. On July 4th, 1849, Nelson was brought before the Court of

Consistory, in Gottenburg, on the charge of spreading 'religious errors,' when the presiding Bishop demanded: 'Do you, Nelson, acknowledge that you have been in such a place, at such a time, and there preached against our Evangelical Lutheran religion, and enticed people to join the errors of the Baptists; and that you, even there, baptized several persons? To this he replied: 'I have often, there and elsewhere, spoken the truth according to the word of God; but as to the charge that I have enticed any one to embrace errors, I could not assent, as I always proved every thing I said by the Bible, and directed the people to the Bible to search for themselves. I also acknowledge having baptized persons.'

At that time the punishment for forsaking the State religion was banishment, and for inducing others to leave it, a fine of two hundred thalers silver and banishment for life. In 1853 Nelson and his Church were banished, and they came to America. About this time, another Mr. Nelson was banished from Sweden for becoming a Roman Catholic, and the friends of religious liberty in England sought relief for the oppressed ones through Lord Palmerston, who, at the time, was Premier there. Dr. Steane, of London, opened a correspondence with a Committee in New York who sought to influence the Swedish government in the interests of religious freedom, through the American government. Dr. Gone and the writer were members of that Committee, and earnest appeals were made to the Swedish government, through Lord Palmerston and General Cass, Secretary of State, at Washington, from 1857 to 1860. The correspondence was of a most interesting character, showing the British Minister and the American Secretary to be the firm friends of religious liberty. These letters were laid before the London and New York Committees, and their contents showed that his Majesty of Sweden was quite willing to sign a bill giving toleration to his subjects, but he was

The American Baptists

hedged in with difficulty. Indeed, he had introduced a measure in the Diet, in favor of enlarged religious liberty, but it was rejected. The case stood about this way: 1. The laws of Sweden recognized all its subjects as born religiously free until they took religious vows upon them to support the State religion. 2. Every parent was required to put his child under those vows within a month of its birth. 3. If these vows were ever cast off, the penalty was banishment. 4. This law could not be altered without the joint consent of the Houses of Peers, Commons and Bishops, three separate bodies, and the royal assent. 5. Under the appeals of the English and American governments, aided by the rising popular opinion of Sweden, a bill for larger religious freedom had twice passed the Peers and Commons, but the House of Bishops had defeated it before it reached the king, who was prepared to give it signature. In time, however, Nelson's sentence was revoked, and he returned to labor in Sweden.

Shortly before Nelson's banishment a Mr. Forsell and a small company in Stockholm had seen the need of a holy life, the abandonment of infant baptism, and a Gospel order of things; and further north still, Rev. Andrew Wiberg, a clergyman of the State Church, had reached the conclusion that unregenerate men should not be admitted to the Lord's Table. While in that state of mind, he visited Germany in company with Mr. Forsell. At Hamburg they consulted Oncken, but Wiberg held fast to his infant baptism and returned to Stockholm. On leaving Hamburg, some brother presented him with 'Pengilly on Baptism,' and on full examination he adopted Baptist principles. Accordingly, he was immersed in the Baltic by Mr. Nelson at eleven o'clock on the night of July 23d, 1852, in the presence of many brethren, and sisters. In quest of health he came to New York, united with the Mariners' Church, was ordained by

advice of a council March 3d, 1853, and in due time returned to Sweden, where his labors have been greatly blessed. This interesting fact is connected with his return to his native land: At the Baptist anniversaries in Chicago, 1855, a letter was read dated from 'a cell in Stockholm Prison, January 25th, 1855,' and signed by a pastor, telling of the imprisonment of fifteen brethren and sisters, on bread and water diet, for taking communion outside of the State Church. The reply of the American Baptists was the appointment of Mr. Wiberg as a missionary of the Publication Society to Sweden. During his absence, fourteen pamphlets had been published against the Baptists, the court preacher had entered the house of Forsell with a policeman, and by force had sprinkled the forehead of a six-months' child. [Was he a Pedobaptist fanatic?] In another place two cows had been seized and sold for the fees of a priest, who had christened two children against the protest of their parents, and a Bishop had given the solemn decision that the Baptists might exist, but they must not increase. Still, one of our brethren had visited Norberg, and the owner of the iron works let his men stop work to listen, and afterwards came with his superintendent 120 miles to Stockholm to be immersed. Returning, he built a chapel, and Wiberg found 23 persons there ready for baptism. A converted Jew came to Stockholm for baptism in May, 1858, and returned to labor in the island of Gottland, and by the close of the next year there were six Churches, with 373 members on the island. A Baptist preacher was sent to Stockholm with a set of thieves, where he was imprisoned for preaching. He not only preached in prison, but, summoned from court to court, he traveled 2,400 miles to obey. Yet he was careful to hold 144 meetings and baptize 116 converts on the journey. One night he was put in a cell, where he preached all night through a wall to a prisoner in the next cell, and

Chapter 13 - Foreign Missions – Asia and Europe

in the morning they bade each other good-by without having seen each other's face.

A young nobleman, Mr. Drake, a graduate of the State Church ministry, at the University of Upsala, was converted and baptized in 1855, when the people set him down for a lunatic. In 1880 this solitary convert met a Baptist Association in the same town, representing 38 churches and 3,416 members. Mr. Wiberg found 24 Baptists at Stockholm. Soon their place of worship could not contain the people. His work on baptism, an octavo volume of 320 pages, had been published at Upsala, he started a semi-monthly paper, called the 'Evangelist,' and, in 1861, he was obliged to visit England to collect money for a new church edifice. There he raised £1,100; then he came to the United States for the same purpose, and now in Stockholm there are three Baptist Churches. The house of worship here spoken of is large, seating 1,200 persons, built of light colored stone: it is well situated, very conveniently arranged, cost about \$25,000, and is paid for. This church is known as the 'Bethel Kappellet;' its communicants number about 2,400; they appeared to the writer to be of the middle and working classes. They sustain several stations in the outskirts of the city and are active in foreign mission work, helping to support a missionary in Spain and, perhaps, some in other countries. Also in Stockholm is the Theological Seminary, of which Rev. K.O. Broady, a former student of Madison University, is president. It has sent out at least 250 ministers, and now, in its beautiful now building, has from twenty-five to thirty students. Rev. J.A. Edgren, D.D., for some time principal of the Scandinavian Department of the Theological Seminary at Chicago, and Rev. Mr. Truve, formerly a student at Madison, who worked in this field with Messrs. Drake, Brady, Wiberg and others, created an evangelical literature for Sweden which is working wonders. The work has

crossed the Baltic and entered Finland. Six or seven Churches have been formed in Norway; one of them in Tromsø, north of the Arctic Circle, and the most northerly Baptist Church on the globe. Here our brethren find no more difficulty in immersing believers once, in January and February, than the Greek Church does in dipping babes three times; and, in 1874 they reported a Laplander amongst the converts. In 1866 the Swedish Mission was transferred from the Publication Society to the Missionary Union. The statistics for the present year, 1886, give this aggregate: 131 Churches, 28,766 members, 478 preachers, the number immersed in 1885, 3,217, and the appropriations from the missionary treasury in Boston for that year, \$6,750.

The Swedish Baptists are yet the victims of cruel laws. The government still holds the absurd theory that all Swedes are born in the National Church, and that they cannot be legally separated therefrom. Yet the trend of modern public opinion has compelled it to make some provision for dissent. Under the pretense of relief it made a Dissenter law in 1860, full of obnoxious restrictions, and in 1873 amended it, under the further pretense of removing them; but still it exacts from them conditions to which they cannot yield and retain their self-respect. They must apply to the King in order to be recognized by the State, laying their creed before him and certifying their intention to leave the State Church; if he grants them the right to exist as a Church, they must give notice to the civil authorities, that the pastor may be held responsible for their worship according to the creed; all change of pastors and the internal affairs of the Church must be reported as a matter of information to the civil authorities; no person can unite with a Baptist Church till he is eighteen years of age; no person can leave the State Church to unite with Baptists without notifying the priest of his

parish two months before doing so; they shall have no schools for their children who are under fifteen years of age, for the teaching of religious truth, without special permission of the King in individual cases, under a fine of from 5 to 500 rix dollars; a public officer who joins the Baptists shall be dismissed from office; a royal decree may revoke the freedom of worship at any time, under the pretense that it is absurd, and non-compliance with these provisions subjects the pastor or Church to heavy fines. By a comical construction of the law, the State holds them all as members of the State Church, unless they comply with these provisions. Our brethren ridicule their forced legal constructions, and leave the authorities to classify them as they please, but go not near the State Church, receive no support from it, and have no respect for its pretensions, but stand alone. They yield no promise to be governed by the Dissenter law; they consider Christ the King of their Churches, and the demands of the State and the King to manage or take cognizance of their internal Church affairs a usurpation. They claim that believers under eighteen years of age have the right from Christ to think for themselves, and they also claim the right to teach their own children under fifteen the Gospel of Christ in Sunday-school or any other school. For these and other reasons they say that if they placed themselves under the Dissenter law they would make a State Church of themselves, with the King at their head and the civil authority for their rulers. Thus, keeping a clear head and clean hands, it is a matter of indifference to them whether the law

counts them in or out of the State Church. The result is that in Stockholm and other large towns, where the sentiment of the people is opposed to the enforcement of the law of 1873, its enforcement is not attempted. But, in more remote districts, fine and imprisonment are still frequent. If our brethren stand firmly, freedom to worship God must in time be their inheritance.

SPAIN. This mission grew out of the temporary residence in that kingdom of Professor W.J. Knapp, formerly of Madison University, afterwards of Yale College. Previous to 1869 he had established himself as an independent missionary in Madrid, and the work grew upon his hands until he was obliged to ask aid of the Missionary Union. In 1870 eighteen of his hearers asked to be baptized, and a Church of thirty-three members was formed in Madrid, another in Alicante, one in La Scala, and one in Valencia. At Linares forty-one were baptized, and several native preachers were raised up. But Mr. Knapp was obliged to return to the United States, political changes connected with the government occurred, and much of the work ceased. Mr. Eric Lund, an earnest Swedish minister, sustained for a time by the Baptist Churches in Sweden, was adopted as its missionary by the Missionary Union, and is its only laborer now in Spain. He resides in Barcelona, and gives much attention to the Swedish seamen who visit that port. A colporteur evangelist holds weekly meetings at Figueras, and a monthly service at La Scala; a monthly evangelical paper is also issued at Barcelona by Mr. Lund.

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

American Baptists had been deeply interested in Foreign Missions from their establishment by the English Baptists in 1792; as is shown in their gifts to the mission at Serampore in 1806 and 1807. In those years \$6,000 were sent to aid Dr. Carey in his work, by American Christians, chiefly Baptists. From the organization of the Baptist General Convention for Foreign Missions, in 1814, to the year 1844, the Northern and Southern Baptists worked earnestly together. But at the latter date the question of domestic slavery not only entered largely into American politics, but into the Churches and religious societies of most American Christians. At that time it so divided the councils of American Baptists, that the North and South deemed it expedient to work in separate missionary organizations both at home and abroad. Hence, in 1845, a society was organized under the title of the 'Southern Baptist Convention,' and in 1846 the Northern Baptists re-organized their mission society, under the title of the 'Baptist Missionary Union.' The Southern Society was located at Richmond, Va., where it has continued its operations with great zeal and wisdom. J.B. Jeter, D.D., was elected President, which office he filled with great efficiency for the following twenty years, and Rev. James B. Taylor, Secretary, who continued to serve till His death, in 1871. The great work which the Southern Convention has accomplished well deserves the volume which Dr. Tupper has devoted to the narration of its sacrifices and successes. It has sustained missions in Brazil, Mexico, Africa, China and Italy, and does an inestimable amount of home mission work in the United States, for the Convention combines both Home and Foreign Mission labor. A review of its work in each of its fields will excite gratitude in all Christian hearts.

CHINA. When the Southern Convention

was formed, Rev. J.L. Shuck and Rev. I.J. Roberts, missionaries, transferred themselves to its direction and support. Mr. Shuck and his wife had been the Baptist missionaries in Canton, from 1836, and had formed the first Baptist Church there. In 1842, when Hong Kong fell into the hands of the British, the missionaries left Canton for a time and sought protection here. Mr. Shuck had baptized his first converts in Macao, in 1837, but the Church at Canton was not formed till 1844; when he returned. The Spirit of God was poured out upon his work, and he found it needful to erect a place of worship. At that time he lost his noble wife, and finding it necessary to bring his children to the United States, he brought, also, one of the Chinese converts with him, and raised \$5,000 for a chapel, but it was thought that wisdom called for the establishment of a mission at Shanghai. He accordingly returned to China in 1847, and labored faithfully till 1851 at Shanghai, where he lost his second wife, and returning to the United States, closed his useful life in South Carolina, after laboring in California from 1854 to 1861.

In 1850 Messrs. Clopton, Percy, Johnson, Whilden, and Miss Baker, were added to the Canton Mission, and between the years 1854-60, Messrs. Gaillard, Graves and Schilling followed. A number of these soon fell on the field, were transferred to other stations, or were obliged to return in broken health, but in 1860, 40 baptisms and 58 Church members were reported. Mr. and Mrs. Williams and Miss Whilden went out in 1872 and did a good work, especially in schools amongst Chinese women. Mr. Simmons and wife reached Canton in 1871, and are still on the field, and Miss Stein joined them in 1879. B.H. Graves, D.D., has been in Canton since 1856, and for a generation has consecrated his life to his holy work with his faithful wife. She was a Miss Morris, of

The American Baptists

Baltimore, known to the writer almost from childhood as a Christian who counted no sacrifice too great for Jesus, and who has stood firmly at her husband's side since 1872. Dr. Graves has published a Life of Christ in Chinese, also a book on Scripture Geography, another on Homiletics, still another on our Lord's Parables, and a Hymn Book.

SHANGHAI. As already stated, this mission was founded in 1847, by Messrs. Yates, Shuck and Tobey, when a Church of ten members was formed, and two native preachers were licensed to preach. When Mr. Percy joined the mission, in 1848, 500 natives attended the services. In 1855, 18 public services a week were held, five day-schools were kept, a Chinese woman was immersed, and about 2,500 persons heard the Gospel weekly. Various other missionaries joined the mission, but after 1865 Dr. Yates and his wife were left alone. Dr. Yates has done a great work for China in the translation of the Scriptures into the Chinese colloquial, the speech of 30,000,000, and in the issue of Chinese tracts. This veteran has pushed his Bible translation to 1 Timothy, and continues on the field in full vigor. The Shantung Mission consisted of the Chefoo and the Tung-chow stations, which have been fully cultivated from 1860; the first by Mr. and Mrs. Hartwell and Mr. Crawford. In 1868 a native preacher baptized 20 converts. There are now in China 56 missionaries and native assistants, 654 Church members and 145 pupils in the schools.

AFRICA. In 1846 the Convention established a mission, in Liberia, and appointed John Day and A.L. Jones (colored) their missionaries; who, at different times have been followed by others. Stations were established in Liberia and Sierra Leone, against all sorts of difficulties and discouragements, largely arising in the opposition of the Africans themselves, who, in many cases, have driven out the

missionaries, especially in the Beir country. Many of those sent have died on the field, while others have not only lived, despite the trials of the climate; but have risen to great usefulness and influence as teachers and preachers. John Day, the first pastor of the Church at Mourovia, established a high school there, in which not only the elementary branches were taught, but classical and theological instruction was given. He died in 1859, but not until he had planted a number of Churches, many Sunday-schools, and preached the Gospel, as he thought, to about 10,000 heathen. Rev. T.J. Bowen established the Yoruba Mission in 1850, and between 1853 and 1856 about a dozen missionaries went to his help. But after they had planted many Churches and schools, many of them fell victims to African disease, and others were driven out by wars and African persecution. Mr. Bowen labored with much zeal and success for a considerable time, but returned to the United States, and during the Civil War in the United States the Convention was compelled to discontinue the African Mission for want of means. But in 1875 it was reorganized by Messrs. David and Colley, who were welcomed by such of the native converts as had held fast their confidence in Christ. At present, Messrs. David and Eubank, with Mrs. Eubank, and four native laborers, are on the field at Lagos, where a new chapel has been erected and good promise for the future is held forth. There are stations also at Abbookuta and Ogbomoshaw, with several minor points; seven or eight missionaries, native and foreign, are laboring earnestly. In 1865, 18 converts were baptized. There are 125 Church members in the mission and 220 scholars in the schools.

BRAZILIAN MISSION. This work was begun in 1879, and has met with the most determined opposition on the ground, so that the missionaries have suffered much in their work of love and reaped light fruit. The

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

missionaries have been Messrs. Quillan, Bagby and Bowen, and the stations Rio de Janeiro, Santa Barbara, Bahia and Macio. The brethren have published two works in Portuguese, 'The True Baptism,' and 'Who are the Baptists,' and have circulated many copies of Mr. Taylor's tract on the 'New Birth.' The field is very hard, but the Convention is full of perseverance and hope. The present Church membership is 168, of whom 23 were baptized in the mission year 1845-46.

MEXICAN MISSION. This mission was taken up with Rev. J.O. Westrup, in 1880, and had scarcely been adopted when that devoted servant of Christ was murdered by a band of Indians and Mexicans. But Mr. Powell is now on the field and about 12 missionaries and teachers are laboring with him in Mexico; at Saltillo, Patos and Parras, also in the Monclova and Rio Grande Districts, in which several stations there are at present about 270 Church members with 216 scholars in the schools.

THE ITALIAN MISSION. This has become one of the most interesting fields occupied by the Convention. Not only must Rome and Italy ever present a peculiar charm for Baptists, because of their immortal connection with Apostolic triumphs, but because during the Middle Ages there was always a little remnant left there who held fast to some of the Baptist principles of the primitive times. The archives of the Inquisition in Venice furnish proof that in a score of towns and villages of Northern Italy the 'Brothers' were found, although they were obliged to escape to Moravia. Then, from 1550, that court had its hands fall in the attempt to exterminate them. Gherlandi and Saga, especially, are of precious memory. Gherlandi's father had designed him for the priesthood, but the holy life and teaching of the 'Brothers' won him, and in 1559 he labored in Italy to bring men back to Apostolic truth. His capture, however, soon cut

short his toils, and when thrust into prison his 'inquisitors pressed him to change his opinions.' 'They are not opinions,' he said, 'but the truth, for which I am ready to die.' Though they drowned him in the lagoon at night, nevertheless, say the 'Baptist Chronicles:' 'His death will be for the revelation of truth.' Saga was born in 1532 and studied at Padua, where, while sick, he was converted through the words of a godly artisan. Dr. Benrath says in 'Studien und Kritiken,' 1885, that when he became a Baptist, his relatives cast him off; and that when he was ready to conduct twenty disciples to Moravia, he was betrayed and taken to Venice, where, after a year's confinement, sentence of death was passed, and in 1565 he was drowned at night in the Sea of Venice.

Modern Baptists prize any land where such heroism has been displayed for the truth, and when the temporal power of the pope fell and Italian unity opened the gates of Rome to free missionary labor, the Southern Convention was not slow to send a man to that post. Dr. W.N. Cote, one of its missionaries on the Continent of Europe, formed a Church of eighteen members in Rome in 1871, but the little flock passed through grave troubles, and Mr. Cote's connection with the Convention ceased. In 1873 Rev. George B. Taylor, son of the first Secretary, James B. Taylor, was appointed to take charge of the mission. He made His way to Rome, a beautiful place of worship was built at a cost of \$30,000, and after laboring with the greatest devotion and wisdom, and with large success, ill-health compelled him to return to Virginia in 1885. Meanwhile the mission is conducted under the general direction of Rev. J.H. Eager, and is in a prosperous condition. The Italian Baptists are beset with peculiar difficulties from many sources, but they are pronounced Baptists, and stand resolutely by their principles. For mutual aid they have formed themselves into an 'Apostolical Baptist

Union,' and support a journal known as '*Il Testimonio*.' They are also developing the practice of self-support somewhat rapidly. They have stations at Rome, Tone Pellice, Pinerola, Milan, Venice, Bologna, Modena, Carpi, Bari, Barletta and the Island of Sardinia. Many of these interests are small, but they aggregate about 288 members. The Foreign Mission Stations of the Southern Baptist Convention number altogether, Stations, 27; Out-stations, 26; Male Missionaries, Foreign and native; 41; Female Missionaries, 33; Churches, 40; Communicants, 1,450; number added in 1885 – 86, 209.

INDIAN MISSIONS. A great work has been done for the Christianization of many Indian tribes by the Southern Convention, chiefly the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws and Seminoles. Rooted amongst the white missionaries to these aborigines, have been Messrs. Buckner, Moffat, Burns, Preston and Murrow, and of converted Indians themselves there have been Peter Folsom, Simon Hancock, Lewis and William Cass and John Jumper. Amongst the various tribes there are 5 Associations, embracing about 8,000 communicants, with many secular and Sunday-schools and meeting-houses.

THE HOME MISSION work of the Convention is done chiefly through the State Mission Board, and is known as the Domestic work. The Domestic Board first took its separate existence in 1845, with Rev. Russell Holman as Corresponding Secretary, who was followed in due time by Rev. Thomas F. Curtis, Rev. Joseph Walker, and again by Mr. Holman. His successors were Rev. M.T. Sumner and Dr. McIntosh; all of whom did a great work for the feeble Churches in almost every Southern city and in every Southern State, especially in Texas, Florida, Arkansas and Georgia. Over \$1,100,000 have been expended on the field, and fully 40,000 persons have been baptized on

their faith in Christ Jesus.

Missionary efforts for the Indians of North America were commenced by the Baptist General Convention in 1817, and prosecuted by the Baptists of the North and South together until 1846. After that the Missionary Union prosecuted its Indian missionary work alone till 1865, when it transferred that department to the American Baptist Home Mission Society. The tribes in which this work was prosecuted during this period, were the Pottawatomies and Miamies, 1817; Cherokees, in North Carolina, 1818; Ottawas, 1822; Creeks, 1823; Oneidas and Tonawandas, including the Tuscaroras, 1824; Choctaws, 1826; Ojibwas, 1828; Shawnees, 1831; Otoes, 1833; Omahas, 1833; Delawares, including the Stockbridges, 1833; and Kickapoos, 1834. The missionaries employed, male and female, numbered upwards of 60, and the missions which yielded the largest fruit were those amongst the Cherokees, Choctaws, Creeks, Ojibwas, Delawares, and Shawnees. The whole number of converts baptized were about 2,000, of whom three quarters were of the Cherokee nation.

In 1826 seven young Pottawatomies were sent as students to Hamilton Theological Seminary for instruction, and two to Vermont as students of medicine. In 1833 a Cherokee native preacher was ordained, another in 1844; in 1850 two more, and in 1852, yet another. In 1835 there was a Choctaw native preacher, and in 1842, there were two others; a Creek Indian became a preacher in 1837, and a Tuscarora, chief was ordained pastor in his own tribe in 1838. The earliest stations amongst the Pottawatomies were called Carey and Thomas stations, in honor of the missionaries in India. Rev. Isaac McCoy was the founder of both these missions. In 1831 these Indians were removed farther westward by the government of the United States, became mixed with other tribes, and the work was suspended in 1844. In

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

1822 schools were formed among the Ottawas and a Church in 1832, with 24 members. They contributed a sum equal to thirty cents per member for missions in 1849; and in 1854 the work was transferred to the Indian Territory. The Cherokee station, in North Carolina, was begun by Rev. Evan Jones and Mr. Roberts in 1825, and in 1838, 156 natives were baptized in the space of ten months. After they were removed to the Indian Territory the work progressed, and in two years their Church numbered 600 members. Mr. Fry joined the station in 1842, and the members were estimated at 1,000. All the Cherokee Churches had meeting-houses, and their was also amongst them a printing-office and a female high school. A missionary periodical was established in 1844, and the translation of the New Testament was completed in 1846. The tribe may well be considered a civilized and Christian nation. The mission amongst the Delawares began with two preaching places; their first missionary was Rev. J.G. Pratt. This mission was finally absorbed in that to the Shawnees. Mr. Bingham conducted the mission to the Ojibwas at Sault Ste. Mary, from 1828 to 1857; the tribe had dwindled away through death and emigration, and the work was given up. Rev. Moses Merrill labored amongst the Otoes from 1833-to 1840, when he died on the field after translating portions of Scripture into the Otoe language; after his death that mission was discontinued. Mr. Willard, formerly missionary to France, and others, remained amongst the Shawnees from 1831 to 1862. At an earlier date, there were missions amongst two or three tribes in Western New York, but the advancing tide of civilization swept them away. Schoolcraft estimates the number of Indians at the discovery of America within the present area of the United States at 1,000,000, but the Report of the United States Commissioner for 1882 gives their number as

only 259,632.

After the Revolutionary War the disjointed condition of the Baptist denomination unfitted it for general missionary work. It needed concert of action, and yet, nothing could force organization upon it so effectually as the pressure of missionary work. From the beginning our people felt the need of pressing the work of personal regeneration, and yet every form of jealousy for reserved rights repelled them from formal organization. Still, the Associations were impelled to co-operation, and helped the Churches to feel their way to concert of action. The Shaftesbury Association, which comprised Northeastern New York and Western Massachusetts, in 1802, sent out Caleb Blood, paying his traveling expenses through Central New York and over the Niagara River into Upper Canada. At that time the Associations, especially the Philadelphia, the Warren and the Shaftesbury, had largely imbibed the missionary spirit and were engaged in home evangelization. The first missionary organization in which American Baptists were active, outside of these, so far as is known, was the 'Boston Female Society for Missionary Purposes.' It was formed in 1800 with 14 members, part of whom were Congregationalists. For the first year it expended \$150 in New England. Several years after this, 1802, a few brethren in Boston, without the action of the Churches, formed the 'Massachusetts Domestic Missionary Society,' the object of which was 'to furnish occasional preaching, and to promote the knowledge of evangelic truth in the new settlements of these United States, or further, if circumstances should render it proper.' In the first year of its operations it sent Joseph Cornell through the northwestern part of the State of New York, and two other missionaries to Maine and New Hampshire, Cornell's journey occupied six months; he traveled 1,000 miles, and preached

in 46 townships, reporting that in 41 of these the people had no religious instruction, and that in 13 no minister had ever preached. This Society existed thirty years and had missionaries in ten States, West as far as Illinois, and South as far as Mississippi. John Ide, Edward Davenport, Amos Chase, Nathanael Kendrick, John M. Peck and James E. Welch were amongst its missionaries. It afterward became the parent of the present Home Mission Society.

There had been scattered communities of Baptists in Missouri from the settlement of that country. Thomas Johnson, of Georgia, had visited it in 1799, while it was under foreign dominion and Roman Catholic control. A few families from the Carolinas, about 1796, made a settlement in St. Louis County. John Clark, an Irish Methodist, became a Baptist, and probably was the first Baptist who ever preached west of the Mississippi. He gathered a Church in 1807.

Before considering the next mission organization, it will be in chronological order here to notice that great movement of explorers and first settlers which planted Baptist Churches in Kentucky at so early a date. Most of its early inhabitants were from Virginia and the Carolinas, principally from Virginia; most of them were Baptists in their religion, and their early ministers brought the strong marks and earnest spirit of their ministry with them. The settlers of Kentucky were generally men of powerful frame and dauntless courage, backwoodsmen, splendidly adapted to the subjugation of this great empire of forests, and these ministers met exactly the wants of the people. For about a score of years they were exposed to the wrath of the savages, who abounded in this world of wilderness. The encroachments of the whites had driven them back from their sea-coast domains, and as these slipped out of their hands, as was natural, they became sullen and vengeful. White emigrants

found their crops destroyed, their stock driven off, their buildings burnt, and their wily foe in ambush to slaughter them in the dark forests. Dr. Spencer gives an illustrative case. The Cook family, from which sprang Abraham Cook, a devout Baptist minister, had removed in 1780 to the forks of Elkhorn, when the father died, leaving his widow and a large family unprotected on this frontier. She struggled with poverty and danger till the year 1792, when her sons, Hosea and Jesse, married. One day a band of Indians fell upon these two sons, while they were shearing sheep, and murdered one of them. The other, mortally wounded, fled to the house, barred the door and fell dead. The two women must now fight the Indians to save themselves and their babes. They had one rifle, but no shot. Finding a musket-ball, however, in her desperation one of the women bit it in two with her teeth, and fired one half at an Indian through a crevice in her log-house, he sprang into the air and fell dead. The savages then tried to force the door, but failing, sprang to the roof to fire the house. As the flames began to kindle, one of the heroines climbed the loft and quenched the fire with water. The Indians fired the roof the second time, but the women, having no more water in the house, took eggs and quenched the fire with them. The Indians kindled the flames the third time, when, having neither eggs nor water left, the poor woman tore the jacket from her murdered husband, saturated with his blood, and smothered the flames with that. Thus baffled, the savages retired, leaving these young mothers clasping their babes to their bosoms, obliged themselves to bury their slaughtered husbands. Many of the early ministers suffered much from the Indians. It is supposed that Rev. John Gerrard was murdered by them.

The Severns Valley Baptist Church was the first, organized in Kentucky, about forty miles south of Louisville, at what is now

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

Elizabethtown, though the church still bears its ancient name. On June 18, 1781, eighteen Baptists met in the wilderness, under a green sugar-tree, and there, directed by Rev. Joseph Barrett, from Virginia, formed themselves into a Baptist Church, choosing Rev. John Gerrard as their pastor. Cedar Creek was the second, founded July 4th, 1781, and Gilbert's Creek the third, constituted under the leadership of Lewis Craig. For several years these Churches, and others that were formed, met with no marks of signal prosperity; but, in 1785, they were visited by a blessed revival of religion, especially those in Upper Kentucky. In 1784 a Church was gathered in the Bear Grass region, about thirty miles from what is now Louisville. At that time several able ministers had settled in the new territory, and the young Churches were greatly prospered. In 1787 Rev. John Gano left his pastoral charge in New York and settled in Kentucky, greatly strengthening the hands of His brethren. This State has now become the fourth Baptist State in the Union in point of numbers, having 61 Associations, 896 ministers, 1,731 Churches, 183,688 members. Last year, 1885, 10,748 persons were immersed into the fellowship of those Churches. Our brethren there have always expected and received 'large things.' In the olden times Jeremiah Vardeman baptized 8,000, Gilbert Mason 4,000, James M. Coleman 4,000, and Daniel Buckner 2,500.

In returning to speak of organized missionary effort, it may be stated that in 1807 a number of brethren, within the limits of the Otsego Association, met on the 27th of August, at Pompey, Onondaga County, N.Y., and organized the Lake Missionary Society, for the 'promotion of the missionary enterprise in the destitute regions around.' Its first missionary was Rev. Salmon Morton, who was engaged at \$4 a week. Two years later the name of the society was changed to the 'Hamilton

Missionary Society.' It was the day of small things, for, in 1815, the society was able to provide only for forty weeks' labor in the course of a year, and it was greatly encouraged to receive from the 'Hamilton Female Missionary Society' in 1812, 'twenty yards of fulled cloth,' to replenish its treasury.

Still, the missionary spirit possessed the hearts of the American Baptists. At the meeting of the Triennial Convention, held in Philadelphia, May 17th, 1817, the sphere of its operations was enlarged by authorizing the Board 'to appropriate a portion of the funds to domestic missionary purposes.' This action diverted attention for a time from the original purpose of the Convention, for during the three ensuing years only three additional missionaries were sent into foreign lands. The Convention was feeling its way, in the absence of missionary experience, and its heart desired to take in the world. Luther Rice had influenced its action by his enlarged plans and holy aims. He possessed great ability, was of most commanding presence and an earnest speaker, and his recent conversion to Baptist principles had stirred the whole country. After his tour through the South and West, he reported a recommendation that a mission should be established in the West, not only on account of the importance of the region in itself, but it was 'indispensably necessary to satisfy the wishes and expectations of pious people in all parts of the United States,' and the Convention took his view of the case. Hence, it gave power to the Board to send missionaries into 'such parts of this country where the seed of the Word may be advantageously cast, and which mission societies on a small scale do not effectively reach.' The direct result of this vote was the appointment of John M. Peck and James E. Welch to this work and the appropriation of \$1,000 for their support. They went West, acting under this commission, where they

established many Churches, amongst them the Church at St. Louis, in the year 1817. James McCoy and Humphrey Posey were sent out under similar commissions to the Indians.

In 1820 the Convention saw that it had attempted too much, and withdrew its support from Messrs. Peek and Welch. Mr. Welch returned East, and Mr. Feck was taken up and supported by the Massachusetts Society. For years he tried in vain to induce the Triennial Convention to resume its work in the West, and so from 1820 to 1833 home mission work was thrown back upon local organizations, Associations and State Conventions. In New York, the Convention was formed in 1821, in Massachusetts, 1824; and in others previous to 1832. After nine years' labor in the West, Mr. Peck returned to New England to arouse new interest in the work of western evangelization, and explained to the Massachusetts Society, in Dr. Baldwin's Church, in Boston, the necessities of this field. He also visited Br. Going, pastor of the Church in Worcester, Mass., and moved his bold but sound judgment and warm heart to examine the subject seriously. The two men corresponded constantly on the subject for five years, when Drs. Going and Belles resolved to visit and inspect the West for themselves. The result was, that the three men sketched a plan, 'to lend efficient aid with promptitude;' and on returning, Dr. Going convinced the Massachusetts Society that a General Home Mission Society should be formed. It was willing to turn over all its interests to a new society, and used its influence to secure its organization: the result was, that on April 27th, 1832 the American Baptist Home Mission Society was formed in New York city, with Hon. Heman Lincoln, of Massachusetts, for its President, Dr. Going for its Corresponding Secretary, and William Colgate for its Treasurer.

In Dr. Going's first report to the Executive Committee of the new society, he made an elaborate statement of Baptist strength in the United States, and the ratio of ministerial supply in various parts of the country. He estimated the whole number of communicants at 385,259, ministers 3,024, Churches 5,321, and Associations, 302. He reckoned the destitution in the Western States as 17 per cent greater than in the Eastern; and while the Churches of New York and New England were supplied with ministers seven eighths of the time, the Middle States were only supplied three eighths, and the Western one eighth. He further calculated that all the ministerial labor in the Valley of the Mississippi was only equal to that of 200 pastors in the East. The managers of the new society 'Resolved' with what they regarded as great boldness, that \$10,000 ought to be raised and expended during the first year, and felt very grateful when Mr. Colgate reported \$6,580.73, as the result of the year's work. But on this sum they had carried 89 missionaries, laboring in 19 States and Territories through that year. In the sixth year the receipts were \$17,238.18, missionaries 116, and 1,421 persons baptized. It is difficult to get at the separate statistics for all the preceding five years, as they were mixed up with the State Conventions, which held certain auxiliary relations to the society. In October, 1837, Dr. Going accepted the presidency of the Literary and Theological Institute at Granville, Ohio, and in 1839, Rev. Benjamin M. Hill, of Troy, N.Y., was elected to fill his place as Home Mission Secretary. As Dr. Going has become so thoroughly historical amongst American Baptists, a fuller sketch of him will be desired.

Jonathan Going, D.D., was of Scotch descent, and was born at Reading, Vermont, March 7th, 1786. He graduated from Brown University in the class of 1809; and during his first year at college, April 6, 1806, he united

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

with the First Baptist Church at Providence, under the care of Rev. Stephen Gano. He pursued his theological studies for a time after his graduation, with President Messer, and then became pastor of the Church at Cavendish, Conn., 1811-1815. In 1815 he became pastor of the Church at Worcester, Mass., and during the first year of His service organized the first Sunday-school in Worcester Co. At that time ardent spirits were in common use amongst Church members and ministers, but Mr. Going took high ground against this practice. It is said that a neighboring Church applied to the Doctor for aid, when he asked if that congregation could not support itself by economizing in the use of liquor? The reply was: 'I think not, sir, I buy mine now by the barrel, at the lowest wholesale rates.' The personal influence of Dr. Going made him a sort of Bishop in all the surrounding country. During his pastorate of 16 years at Worcester; 350 additions were made to his Church. Hon. Isaac Davis, for many years a member of his Church and a personal friend, said of him: 'If there was an ordination, a revival of religion, & difficulty in a Church, or a public meeting in aid of some benevolent object, within 30 or 40 miles, the services of our pastor were very likely to be called for. Every body saw that his heart was in the great cause, not only of benevolent action but of the common Christianity, and every body expected that he would respond cheerfully and effectively to all reasonable claims that were made upon him.' After taking charge of Granville College, his influence in Ohio became as extensive and healthful as in Massachusetts, but he was permitted to fill His place only till November 9, 1844, when he fell asleep in Jesus, lamented by all who knew him.

Much might be said of Dr. Hill's secretaryship in the Home Mission Society, which he filled for 22 years. He was a native of Newport, R.I., born April 5, 1793. He entered

the Pennsylvania University to prepare for the medical profession, but was converted at the age of 19 and became a pastor at 25. He served two smaller Churches first, then spent 9 years as pastor of the First Church, New Haven, Conn., and 10 years as pastor of the First Church Troy, N.Y., before he accepted the place vacated by Dr. Going. During the period of his secretaryship the country and the Society were agitated by several very exciting and perplexing questions, but under his firm and judicious management, it derived no serious injury from any of them. He kept his head and heart upon the one aim of the Society, 'North America for Christ,' and he did much to bring it to the Saviour's feet. One of the serious practical difficulties which beset the Society in the prosecution of its western work was not readily overcome. In many sections a salaried ministry was denounced, and many otherwise sensible people looked upon the plan of missions as a speculation and the missionaries were set down as hirelings. In November, 1833, a Convention met in Cincinnati, where representative men from various portions of the South and West met representatives of the Home Mission Society, face to face, to exchange views on the subject. This meeting did much to dispel prejudice and ignorance. Still, for many years the narrow-minded folk in the West treated the honest, hard working missionaries much as they would be treated by fairly decent pagans. Only persistent work and high Christian character conquered the recognition of their gifts and self-sacrificing life.

The settlement of the interior in regard to intelligence, virtue and religion, as well as free government, had been a matter of great solicitude with the earlier statesmen of the country. Under the colonial date of July 2d, 1756, Benjamin Franklin wrote to George Whitefield:

The American Baptists

'You mention your frequent wish that you were a chaplain in the American Army. I sometimes wish that you and I were jointly employed by the crown to settle a colony on the Ohio. I imagine that we could do it effectually, and without putting the nation to much expense; but, I fear, we shall never be called upon for such a service. What a glorious thing it would be to settle in that fine country a large, strong body of religious and industrious people! What a security to the other colonies, and advantage to Britain, by increasing her people, territory, strength and commerce! Might it not greatly facilitate the introduction of pure religion among the heathen, if we could by such a colony, show them a better sample of Christians than they commonly see in our Indian traders? – the most vicious and abandoned wretches of our nation! Life, like a dramatic piece, should not only be conducted with regularity, but, methinks, it should finish handsomely. Being now in the last act, I begin to cast about for something fit to end with. Or, if mine be more properly compared to an epigram, as some of its lines are but barely tolerable, I am very desirous of concluding with a bright point. In such an enterprise, I could spend the remainder of life with pleasure, and I firmly believe God would bless us with success, if we undertake it with a sincere regard to his honor, the service of our gracious king, and (which is the same thing) the public good.'

Although the wish of Franklin to enter the heart of the country with Whitefield, as missionaries, for 'the introduction of pure religion among the heathen,' and to found a colony to the 'honor' of God, it was reserved to others, as honorable and as noble, to compose an 'epigram' there, under a Republic of which neither of these great men dreamed when the philosopher expressed this wish. In a quiet way single missionaries there have done an almost superhuman work. Fourteen of the-strongest Churches in Illinois and Michigan were planted by that pure-hearted man, Thomas Powell, as well as the Illinois River Association. Out of this body in turn have come the Ottawa, Rock

River, East Illinois River and the McLean Associations, which were organized under his direction. Dr. Temple wrote his friend, Dr. Sommers, in 1833, concerning Chicago, then, a mere trading post: 'We have no servant of the Lord Jesus to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation...I write to beg that you will see Brother Going and ask that a young man of first-rate talent, whose whole heart is in the cause of Christ, may be sent to it immediately. I will myself become responsible for \$200 per annum for such a missionary.' Dr. Going found the young man in Rev. A.B. Freeman, who had just graduated from Hamilton, and justified what seemed hasty, by saying that 'Chicago promises to become a very important place on very many accounts, and it is deemed highly important that we have a footing there at an early date.' In October, 1833, the First Church in Chicago was organized in what is today one of the centers of power in our land.

Under the administration of Dr. Hill, the work of the Home Mission Society began to assume its fuller proportion of importance to American Baptists. In 1832 its principal field was the Mississippi Valley, extending from Galena to New Orleans, embracing about 4,000,000 people, but in twenty years from that time the vast stretch west of the great river was opened up to the Pacific Ocean. What, in 1832, stood upon the maps as the 'Great American Desert,' an immense empire of black waste, became Kansas, Oregon, Minnesota, as States; while Nebraska, Washington, Dakota, Nevada and Colorado were becoming rapidly colonized in 1852. At the close of Dr. Hill's service, the operations of the Society extended into Kansas and the Territory of Nebraska, 160 miles up the Missouri River from the Kansas line; up the Mississippi to its junction with the St. Croix, thence to the Falls of the St. Croix, and to the head of Lake Superior. The necessity had been forced upon the-Society of doing something to

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

assist infant Churches to secure houses of worships This was a new order of work, and at first, appropriations were made in the form of loans at a light interest of two per cent. Many of the Churches were paying 8 to 12 per cent., and the aim was to help them to help themselves, by making the interest as nearly nominal as might be, and when the principal was re-paid, to re-loan it to other Churches for similar use. Dr. Hill published a plea for the Church Edifice Fund, aiming to raise \$100,000 for this purpose. The plan was a wise one, but the movement had scarcely been inaugurated when the financial panic of 1857 fell upon the country, and the responses in money were light. In 1866, when the funds were used only in the form of loans and the gift system had ceased, the receipts ran up to \$72,005 13, of which \$30,000 was made a permanent fund. Rev. E.E.L. Taylor, D.D., of Brooklyn, N.Y., a man of large ability every way and a most successful pastor, was appointed to raise the permanent fund to \$500,000. He labored nobly in his work till 1874, when his Lord called him to his temple above. He had, however, secured \$130,000 for the fund.

Dr. Hill declined further service in 1862, and Dr. Jay S. Backus, one of the most vigorous minds and consecrated pastors in the denomination, was chosen as his successor. He served from 1862 to 1867 as the only Secretary, but in 1867 Rev. J.B. Simmons, D.D., of Philadelphia, was appointed an additional Corresponding Secretary, with special reference to the Freedmen's work, and in 1869 Dr. Taylor was added to his colleagues with special regard to the Church Edifice Fund. Dr. Simmons stood the peer of his two fellow-secretaries in wisdom and goodness. He was a graduate of Brown University and of Newton Theological Seminary, and had done delightful pastoral work in Indianapolis and Philadelphia. Thus equipped, the Society stood ready to follow the

lead of these three men of God, and well did each of them stand in his lot. The times were extremely trying, for the country had just passed through its severe Civil War, slavery had ceased to exist, and an unexpected change of circumstances called for various modifications in the work of the Society. The new secretaryship, filled by Dr. Simmons, sprang from these necessary changes. At the close of the war the Annual Meeting of the Society was held at St. Louis, May, 1865, when it resolved to prosecute missionary work amongst the Freedmen. Dr. Edward Lathrop and Mr. J.B. Hoyt were sent to visit the Southern Baptists to invite their co-operation in this work, and in 1867 a delegation was sent to the Southern Baptist Convention, at Baltimore, to further that object. That Convention reciprocated these brotherly interchanges, and appointed a similar delegation to meet the Home Mission Society, a few days later, at its annual meeting, in New York. Drs. Jeter and J.A. Broadus made addresses in which conciliation and brotherly affection abounded. Various methods of practical co-operation were suggested, but the Committee which reported on the subject could do little more than recommend that co-operation should be sought and had in all ways that should be found practicable.

In December, 1864, however, a company of Baptists had, on their personal responsibility, formed 'The National Theological Institute,' at Washington, to provide religious and educational instruction for the Freedmen. At the St. Louis meeting of the Home Mission Society in 1845, it was reported that \$4,978.69 had been received by its Treasurer for a Freedmen's Fund, and that the Society had already 68 missionaries laboring amongst them in twelve Southern States. The Board was instructed to continue this work. The Institute conferred with the Home Missionary Society as to the best

The American Baptists

method of conducting this work, for, in 1867, it had schools under its direction at Washington, Alexandria, Williamsburg and Lynchburg, with \$3,000 in books and clothing, and \$18,000 in money, for their support. The result of much conference was, a recommendation made by a committee, consisting of Messrs. Mason, Hague, T.D. Anderson, Fulton, Bishop, Peck and Armitage, to the Home Mission Board, to organize a special department for this work. This being done, Dr. Simmons was chosen Secretary by the Society, especially for this department. His work naturally divided itself into missionary and educational branches. All ordained missionaries, of whom there were about 30 each year, were instructed to give religious tuition to classes of colored ministers. Dr. Marston reported, that in two years 1,527 ministers and 696 deacons were present at classes which he held. Before Dr. Simmons's election, amongst others, Prof. H.J. Ripley, at Savannah, Ga.; Dr. Solomon Peck, at Beaufort, N.C.; Rev. H.L. Wayland, at Nashville, Tenn.; and Rev. D.W. Phillips, at Knoxville, Tenn.; were engaged in this important work, so that over 4,000 pupils were gathered into these schools. The Society held that the teacher for the common school was secondary to the education of the colored preacher. Teachers were impressed with the responsibility of winning souls to Christ, and those converted in the schools were sent forth to become teachers, pastors' wives, and missionaries to their own people. Fifteen institutions for the colored people have been established with an enrollment in 1885 of 2,955 pupils, 1,391 of them young men, 1,564 young women and 103 teachers. These institutions are all designed primarily for these who are to be preachers or teachers; two are for the separate instruction of women, and one is distinctively a Theological Institution. Industrial education is given in nearly all of them, and the demand for medical

education, so closely connected with the moral and religious education of the race, is one that generous patrons are considering. Dr. Simmons continued in this work till 1874, and it is still prosecuted with vigor and success.

Mrs. Benedict, of Pawtucket, R.I., widow of Deacon Stephen Benedict, gave \$30,000 for the establishment of the Benedict Institute, in Columbia, S.C. Deacon Holbrook Chamberlain, of Brooklyn, N.Y., gave fully \$150,000 for the Freedmen's work, most of it for the founding and support of the Leland University, at New Orleans, La., and others gave large sums for the same cause. After the Civil War the colored Baptists in the South constituted separate Churches and Associations of their own, though previous to that, as a rule, they had been members of the same Churches with the white Baptists. At its session, held at Charleston, 1875, the Southern Convention said:

'In the impoverished condition of the South, and with the need of strengthening the special work which the Southern Baptist Convention is committed to prosecute, there is no probability of an early endowment of schools under our charge for the better education of a colored ministry. The Convention has adopted the policy of sustaining students at the seminaries controlled by the American Baptist Home Mission Society. It is much to be desired that larger contributions for this purpose may be secured from both white and colored Baptists.'

The Georgia Baptist Convention said in the same year:

'The Institute for colored ministers, under the care and instruction of our esteemed brother, J.T. Robert, is doing a noble work for our colored population. We trust that many will avail themselves of the excellent course of instruction there, and that the school may prove an incalculable blessing in evangelizing and elevating the race.' In 1878 it added: 'We recommend our brethren to aid in sending

Chapter 14 - Other Baptist Missions – Foreign and Home

pious and promising young men, who have the ministry in view, to this school, which consideration was urged in view of the fact, among other facts, that Romanists are making strenuous efforts to control our colored people, by giving them cheap or gratuitous instruction.' And in 1879 the same Convention resolved that: 'The institution deserves our sympathy and most cordial co-operation. It is doing a most important work, and is indispensable as an educator of this most needy class of our population.'

The Baptist Seminary and the Spelman Seminary, located at Atlanta, are doing a truly wonderful work. The latter was largely endowed by the philanthropist, John D. Rockefeller, and bears Mrs. Rockefeller's maiden name. It has 626 pupils, and its income for 1885 was \$7,133; Sidney Root, Esq., of Atlanta, has been unwearied in his zeal to build up both these useful institutions.

At the Annual Meeting, held in Washington, in 1874, the Society elected but one Corresponding Secretary to take charge of the mission and educational work, Dr. Nathan Bishop; with Dr. Taylor in charge of the Church Edifice Fund. But as Dr. Taylor died that year, Dr. Bishop was left alone. From 1876 to 1879 Dr. Cutting served as Corresponding Secretary, when he was succeeded by Rev. H.L. Morehouse, D.D., the present Secretary, whose very successful administration has brought up the Society to a position commensurate with the times, and to a position of strength worthy of its preceding history.

As Nathan Bishop, LL.D. was a layman, and did so much for the interests of the Baptist denomination generally, this chapter cannot be more fittingly closed than by a brief sketch of his life and labors. He was pre-eminently a scholar, a Christian gentleman, a philanthropist and a man of large religious affairs. He was born in Oneida County, N.Y., August 12th, 1808. His father was a Justice of the Peace and

a farmer, and brought up his son to habits of thorough industry and economy. While yet a youth, Nathan was converted, under the labors of Rev. P.P. Brown, and united with the Baptist Church at Vernon. Early he displayed an uncommon love for knowledge with a highly consistent zeal for Christ, a rare executive ability and a mature self-possession. At eighteen, he entered the Academy at Hamilton, N.Y., and Brown University in the year 1832. There he became a model student, known by all as full of quiet energy, a Christian of deep convictions, delighting in hard work, manly, self-denying and benevolent, and graduated with high honor. In 1838 he was appointed Superintendent of Common Schools in Providence, where he re-organized the whole plan of popular education. In 1851 he filled the same office in Boston, and for six years devoted his great ability to elevating its common schools to a very high rank. He married and settled in New York in 1858, and here he identified himself with every line of public beneficence, to the time of his death, August 7th, 1880. He was a leader in the Christian Commission, the Board of State Commissions of Public Charities, the Sabbath Committee, the American Bible Society, the Evangelical Alliance; and, under the administration of General Grant, he served in the Board of the United States Indian Commissioners. No man contributed more invaluable time and toil to the development and upbuilding of Vassar College, or to the New York Orphan Asylum, and, in his denomination, every department of benevolent operation felt his influence. In the City Mission, the Social Union and the Home for the Aged, he put forth a molding and strengthening hand from their organization. But the greatest service, and that which must be ever associated with his honored name, was rendered in association with Baptist Missionary work, in

The American Baptists

both the Home and Foreign departments. Although never a wealthy man, he was a prodigy of liberality all his life, and when he died he left the most of his property for mission uses. For many years he gave his most precious time to the Home Mission Society, and for two years discharged the duties of its Corresponding Secretaryship without charge, besides increasing his contributions to the treasury. While he was Secretary, he and Mrs. Bishop made a centennial offering to the Society of \$30,000, besides large gifts to the Freedmen's fund. Once the Doctor said to Dr. Simmons: 'I have been blamed for giving so many thousand dollars for the benefit of colored men. But I

expect to stand side by side with these men in the day of judgment. Their Lord is my Lord. They and I are brethren, and I am determined to be prepared for that meeting.' No man ever known to the writer was more completely devoted, body, soul and spirit, in labor for man and love for God than Dr. Bishop. He had as robust a body, as broad a mind and as warm a heart as ever fall to the lot of Christian humanity; and not a jot or tittle of either did he withhold from this holy service. Yet, when told that death was near and that he would soon be free from extreme pain and enter into rest, his only reply was the expression of a grateful soul that he should soon begin a life of activity.

Chapter 15 - Preachers – Educators – Authors

In the absence of the connectional principle in the life of Baptist Churches, their history and united efforts are at times largely included in the biography of particular individuals, who have left the impress of their minds and hearts upon their own times and on succeeding generations. Of none is this more true than of several individuals who have had much to do with those great movements that must now be mentioned. Few of our American fathers acted a more prominent part in the work of missions, whether on the home or foreign field, than the immortal Thomas Baldwin; and having already spoken of him at some length, it will be but needful here to glance at his Boston ministry and general character. After serving the Church at Canaan, N.H., for seven years, he became the pastor of the Second Baptist Church, in Boston, in 1790, which responsible office he filled till His death, in 1825. His labors were most abundant, and his success in the conversion of men to Christ was very great. He was not a graduate of any college, but he fostered all educational projects; nor did he love controversy, but when he found it necessary to defend Baptist principles against the pen of the celebrated Dr. Worcester he did so with faithful vigor. Dr. Stillman and himself were fast friends and true yoke-fellows in every good work. As politicians, Stillman was a firm Federalist, and Baldwin as firm a Jeffersonian Democrat, and generally on Fast Day and Thanksgiving-day they preached on the points in dispute here, because, as patriots, they held them essential to the well-being of the Republic, especially, in the exciting conflicts of 1800-01: yet, there never was a moment of ill feeling between them. On these days, the Federalists of both their congregations went to hear Dr. Stillman and the Democrats went to Baldwin's place, but on other days they remained at home, like Christian gentlemen,

and honored their pastors as men of that stamp. Dr. Baldwin filled many important stations with the greatest modesty and meekness, for with a powerful intellect he possessed his temper in unruffled serenity; all men seemed to honor him, as his spirit was the breath of love. Few painters could have thrown that peculiar charm into his countenance which is seen at a look, had it not first been in his character. The soul of patience, he was inspired with a stern love of justice, and commanded a large fund of playful humor and innocent wit. His manners were unaffected, simple and dignified, so that in him heart-kindness and rectitude blended in a rare degree, and his counsel carried weight by its vigorous discrimination. The Massachusetts Missionary Society, and after it the Missionary Union, were great debtors to His zeal and wisdom. As an independent thinker, without petty ends to gain or fitful gusts of passion to indulge, all trusted him safely.

Before he entered the ministry he served the State of New Hampshire as a legislator in its General Court; and after his removal to Boston he was frequently elected chaplain to the General Court of Massachusetts, he also served as a member of the Constitutional Convention of Massachusetts, in 1821, and took an active part in its discussions. For many years he was a Trustee and Fellow of Brown University, a Trustee of Waterville College from its organization, also of Columbian College. His first work as an author was 'Open Communion Examined,' published in 1789, at the request of the Woodstock (Vt.) Association. His second was a volume of about 250 pages, in reply to Dr. Samuel Worcester's attack on the Baptists. This work amply vindicated the sentiments of the Baptists, and did much at the time, by its vigor of intellect, its strength of logic and its Christ-like spirit, to arrest the unwelcome treatment which they met at the hands of their

assailants. Dr. Baldwin was born at Bozrah, Conn., December 23d, 1753, and died at Waterville, Me., August 29th, 1825, having gone there to attend the commencement of the college.

REV. STEPHEN GANO, M.D., was another master in Israel, who had much to do with the shaping of his own times. He was born in New York, December 25th, 1762. In consequence of the disturbances of the Revolutionary War he was not able to attend the Rhode Island College, then under the care of his uncle, Dr. Manning, but he was put under the care of Dr. Stiles, of New Jersey, another uncle, to study medicine. At the age of nineteen he entered the army as a surgeon, where he remained for two years, and then settled at Tappan, N.Y. He says that when he left his mother for the army she buckled on his regimentals, which her own hands had made, saying: 'My son, may God preserve your life and patriotism. The one may fall a sacrifice in retaking and preserving the home of your childhood (New York was then in the hands of the British), but never let me hear that you have forfeited the birthright of a freeman.' His father had already gone to the war, and Stephen adds: 'Without a tear she saw me depart, bidding me trust in God and be valiant.' The next morning his regiment marched to Danbury, where he witnessed the burning of that town. He speaks of his after marches in the army, under Col. Lamb, as traced in their blood on the snow, and of shoes being sent to them which Gen. Lafayette had provided in France. After this, he served as surgeon in the new brig commanded by Decatur, of whom he says, 'a braver man never trod the deck of any vessel.' She was captured, for she ran on a reef of rocks, when: 'Finding escape impossible, we managed to cut away her leaders and nailed her flag to the mast, and long after we were captured our stars and stripes floated over her deck.' After their

capture, Gano and thirty-four others were left upon Turk's Island without food, to perish. There he was taken so sick that he appeared to be dying. His companions, however, found some conchs on the shore and roasted them. They raised his fainting head from the sand-beach, and gave him a portion of the liquor, saying: 'Gano, take this and live, we will yet beat the British.' He revived, and after some days was taken to St. Francis. Upon landing there, he begged from door to door for a morsel of bread, till a woman gave him half a loaf, which he shared with his companions. After working hard to load a vessel with salt, he obtained passage on a brig for Philadelphia, but when four days out was re-captured and taken into New Providence. Here he was put on board a prison-ship, fastened in chains, and nearly died of hunger. After a time he was exchanged as a prisoner, but safely reached Philadelphia, and soon entered on the practice of medicine at Tappan, N.Y.

There he was converted and in 1786 was set apart to the Gospel ministry. In the sketch of himself which he wrote for his children he speaks of his early abhorrence of intoxicating drinks thus: 'When four years old, milk-punch was recommended in the small-pox, which I had most severely. My mother has informed me that, when she urged my taking it lest I should die, I replied to her, "Then I will die." This repugnance he carried through life. He also speaks of visiting his grandmother when he was thirteen and she was more than fourscore years of age. 'On first seeing me she bade me kneel beside her, and gently placing her aged hand on my youthful head she offered up a fervent petition for my salvation, when, after a short silence of prayerful abstraction, she said: "Stephen, the Lord designs thee for a minister of the everlasting Gospel. Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life.'" He also tells us that, while under conviction for sin,

an elderly lady, a neighbor and intimate friend of his wife, seeing his distress of mind, thought that she would show him the way of salvation. She confessed, however, that she had been seeking her own salvation for forty years but had not then been saved. They bowed before the Lord together in prayer and agreed to pray for each other. A few days passed, and one night he found himself so happy in Christ that he could not wait for the dawn of day, but urged his horse at full speed to the house of his aged friend, to tell her what the Lord had done for his soul. He rapped at the door and she, raising an upper window, asked: 'Doctor, is your wife ill?' 'O no,' he cried, 'I have found Jesus precious and have come to tell you.' She replied: 'I was only waiting for daylight to come and tell you that I am rejoicing in him, with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' That day he wrote the joyful news to his parents, saying: 'Tell it upon the house-tops that Stephen is among the redeemed.' His father, John Gano, replied: 'As I never expect to be nearer the house-top, in a suitable situation to make known the joyful news of my dear son's conversion, than the pulpit, I read his letter from thence on the last Sabbath.' Stephen's daughter says that after her father's death she was mentioning this letter to an aged minister, who said: 'When I was a thoughtless lad of sixteen I went to hear your grandfather preach and was present at the very time when your father's letter was read, and that, with the accompanying remarks, was one of the means of my conversion and had its weight in leading me into the ministry.' The ordination of Stephen, in his father's church, at the age of twenty-three, put great honor upon the faith both of his mother and grandmother. When he was left on Turk's Island, news reached his mother that he was dead. This she did not believe, but said: 'When I gave my son to my country I gave him to God. After his departure,

I felt an assurance that God had accepted the gift for his own service. I believe that he will yet be an able, faithful, successful, and, it may be, deeply-tried minister of the Gospel of Christ.'

Her faith was prophetic. In 1792 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church at Providence, where he continued until his death, in 1828, having filled its pastorate for thirty-six years. His ministry was remarkably successful. When he became pastor his Church numbered but 165 members, but five new Churches sprang up, mostly from his own, and when he died the ancient Church itself numbered above 600 members. He stood pre-eminent amongst his brethren as a public speaker and a leader in all denominational affairs. His executive ability was large, his punctuality in dispatching business and his large forecast gave him great influence in all Baptist councils. For nineteen years in succession he acted as Moderator in the Warren Association. He constantly preached with an eye to the copious outpourings of the Holy Spirit, and he enjoyed many revivals of religion in his Church. With some hundreds of others, he baptized his six daughters, four of whom became the wives of Baptist ministers, amongst whom were the late Drs. Henry Jackson and David Benedict, the historian. Few men have left a more hallowed influence on the Baptists of America than Stephen Gano. His doctrines were of the purely orthodox pattern, especially in all that related to the person and work of Christ. At the close of a sermon on his Deity he says: 'The sentiment I have been presenting to you, and which I have feebly supported in this place and from this pulpit for more than thirty-five years, is now the only ground of my hope, and that which I wish to commend when the messenger of death shall summon my soul to an account before the only wise God and Saviour.'

REV. ALFRED BENNETT was born at

Mansfield, Conn., in 1780, and lived to be honored for years and influence, being long known as 'Father Bennett.' He was a contemporary of Baldwin and Gano, and labored side by side with them for many years in promoting foreign missions. He was licensed to preach in 1806, by the Church at Homer, N.Y., and became its pastor in 1807. His early ministry there was so blessed of God that his Church sent out two new Churches in the vicinity, and great revivals followed his labors. Like most of the pastors of his day, he preached much abroad, especially in the region which now forms the central counties of New York, and he left a holy influence wherever he went. From 1832 to the close of his life, in 1861, he devoted his time to pleading the cause of foreign missions, and was one of the chief instruments in establishing that love of missionary enterprise which characterizes the Baptists of the State of New York. More than a generation has passed since he departed this life, yet his name is always pronounced with reverence. In person he was tall, of a dark complexion, thin and stooping. He had a fine head, with strong features, a winning address and an earnest spirit. He was attended by an atmosphere of firm devotion and close walk with God.

REV. DANIEL SHARP, D.D., was a native of Huddersfield, Yorkshire; born December 25th, 1783. His father was the pastor of a Baptist Church at Farsley, near Leeds. Early in life Daniel became a Christian, united with a Congregational Church, and was greatly prospered in secular business. He came to the United States in 1806, when he began to examine the difference between himself and the Baptists, and, as the result, united with the Fayette Street Church, New York, of which he soon became a very useful member. Then he believed himself called of God to the Christian ministry, and preached his first sermon in the

outskirts of the city. In March, 1807, he began a course of theological studies with Dr. Staughton, of Philadelphia, and was ordained pastor of the First Church at Newark, N.J., in 1809, where he remained until 1812, when he became pastor of the Charles Street Church, Boston, Mass. Here his large capacities for usefulness developed in every sphere, especially in preaching the Gospel and in laying broad foundations for foreign mission work and the education of the ministry. When Baptist educational movements led to the formation of the Newton Institution, he was one of its foremost advocates, and for eighteen years presided over its Board of Trustees. He also became a Fellow in the Corporation of Brown University, and one of the Board of Overseers in Harvard. In Boston his public influence was general and healthful, for His talents, with the purity and beneficence of his life, commended him to all. His personal presence bespoke the man of mark wherever he went. The cast of his face was noble, albeit the compression of His mouth and the glint of his eye indicated sternness of demeanor and the power to slant a satire; indeed, his whole carriage said: 'I magnify mine office.' Yet, where his suspicion was not excited or his confidence challenged, he was as winsome as a child, and trusted men implicitly; but ever insisted in return on transparent simplicity and staunch honor in all their conduct. His conservatism always demanded the unity and peace of consistent integrity. In a sermon to his own people he says: 'One Diotrephes may destroy the peace of a Church. It is a melancholy fact that some men must be first or they will do nothing. They will rule or rage; and the misfortune is, they rage if they rule. May God preserve me from such good men.' Dr. Sharp was tall in stature and very erect, elegant, benignant and courtly in his manners, and his eloquent ministry held the respect of the whole community in Boston for

one-and-forty years. He was emphatically a teacher and a father in Israel; at the same time, in all spheres of refined society, he was a rare specimen of the fine old English gentleman. He died in 1853.

SAMUEL F. SMITH, D.D. Few men are now living who have more beautifully adorned our ministry, or more earnestly aided our missions, than the modest and widely-known author of our national hymn, 'My Country! 'tis of Thee.' Dr. Smith was born in Boston, Mass., October 21st, 1808. He was fitted for college in the Latin School of that city, and was a Franklin Medal scholar. He graduated at Harvard in 1829, in the class with Oliver Wendell Holmes, Judge B.R. Curtis, Judge Bigelow, James Freeman Clarke, Professor Benjamin Pierce and other men of distinction. In Dr. Holmes's poem on 'The Boys' he sings of him thus:

'And there's a nice youngster of excellent pith;
Fate tried to conceal him by calling him
Smith;
But he shouted, a song for the brave and the
free
Just read on his medal, "My country, of thee!"'

He was a student in the Andover Theological Institute from 1829 to 1832, when he became the editor of the 'Baptist Missionary Magazine' for one year. In February, 1834, he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church at Waterville, Maine, and was Professor of Modern Languages in the College there for eight years. From 1842 to 1854, twelve years and a half, he was pastor of the First Baptist Church at Newton, Mass. Then, for seven years, 1842 to 1849, he was editor of the 'Christian Review,' and for fifteen years editor and translator of the 'Missionary Union.' His soul-stirring national hymn, known to every statesman and school-child in the republic, was written at Andover, in 1832, and also his great

missionary hymn, 'The Morning Light is Breaking.' He translated an entire volume of Brockhaus's 'Conversations Lexicon' from the German, which was incorporated into the 'Cyclopaedia Americana,' and, in association with the late Lowell Mason, wrote or translated from German music-books nearly every song in the 'Juvenile Lyre,' the first book of music and songs for children published in the United States, he has rendered great service to Churches and Sunday-schools as the compiler of 'Lyric Gems' and 'Rock of Ages,' as the editor of four volumes of juvenile literature, and also as the principal compiler of the 'Psalmist,' a hymn-book which the greater part of the Baptist denomination used for thirty years, and which contained about thirty of his own hymns. His busy pen also produced the 'Life of Rev. Joseph Grafton,' 'Missionary Sketches,' 'Rambles in Mission Fields,' the 'History of Newton, Mass.,' with endless contributions to periodical and review literature. Dr. Smith visited Europe in 1875-76, and again in 1880-82, extending his journey to Asia and visiting the Baptist missions in Burma, India and Ceylon, as well as the European missions in France, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Turkey, Greece, Italy and Spain. He married the granddaughter of Dr. Hezekiah Smith, of great renown in Baptist life, and his son, Rev. Dr. D.A.W. Smith, has been a missionary in Burma since 1863, and is now President of the Karen Theological Seminary at Rangoon. No man amongst Baptists is better known or more beloved for his learning, usefulness and Christlike spirit, his brethren generally appreciating him as in regular lineal descent from Nathaniel, 'an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile.'

REV. WILLIAM B. WILLIAMS, D.D. LL.D., was of general and denominational celebrity, he was born in New York, October

14th, 1804, and was the son of Rev. John Williams, at that time pastor of the Oliver Street Baptist Church. He entered Columbia College at the age of fourteen, and graduated in 1822, after which he studied law with Peter A. Jay, nephew of the former Chief Justice of the United States and one of the most eminent lawyers of his day. Mr. Williams was admitted to the bar in 1826 and became Mr. Jay's partner in business. His father died in 1825 and his mother in 1826. He so took to heart this double affliction that his sorrow impaired his health, and he spent the year 1827 in Europe. After his return he practiced law alone for a time; then conviction of duty led him into the Christian ministry, and in June, 1832, he commenced preaching in the Broadway Hall, to the congregation afterwards known as the Amity Street Church. This body came from the Oliver Street Church, and was constituted with 43 members December 17th, 1832. Dr. Francis Wayland preached his ordination sermon in the Oliver Street Meeting-house, Dr. Cone being then pastor of that Church. The old Church lovingly provided its former pastor's son with lots for a new Church edifice in Amity Street, which building was completed in the following year. At that time Mr. Williams's health was firm, his voice full and sound, and the house was constantly crowded by a refined congregation. His discourses abounded in vast wealth of thought, deep spirituality and rare literary beauty. After a few years his voice failed, and in consequence of its feebleness it was difficult to hear him, so that while his congregation retained its high character for intelligence it became small. Yet Dr. Williams reached that super-eminent distinction as a preacher which never decreased, but rather increased to the close of his life. His ideal standard of literary excellence was so high that he looked upon the best of his own productions with suspicion, and most reluctantly put them to

the press.

Probably the first manuscript which he consented to print was a brief memoir of his father, written in 1825, and published anonymously in an Appendix to the Memoir of Dr. Stanford; by Dr. Sommers, in 1835. It covers but 23 pages, and is one of the simplest, sweetest and most perfect pieces of biography to be met with. Its style differs entirely from that of the doctor's later years, is less ornate and most sweetly tender, the tribute of a loving son to the memory of his loving father. It is as direct as a sunbeam, and does not contain a sentence to recall the movement of Addison or Steele, much less that of Foster or Hall. Neither the head nor heart of that man is to be envied who can, unmoved, read this lucid story of his holy father written with tears in every line. Dr. Williams's resources in literature, philosophy, history and theology appeared to be unlimited, and his memory was so capacious and exact that the researches of an industrious life came at command. Many thought, after the failure of his voice, that his great moulding influence on the young could best be felt in the chair of a College or Theological Seminary, and high positions of this order were frequently tendered to him; but he was never willing to leave his pastorate, and died as pastor of the Church of which he was ordained, having filled his office for more than 51 years. He was a close student, and his mental powers grew to the close of life. His library was selected with the greatest care, numbering about 20,000 volumes. His pen was never at rest. The notes which he made on His reading alone numbered eight volumes. His first known publication was an address delivered at Madison University, in 1843, on the 'Conservative Principle in our Literature.' It excited universal attention by its affluence of thought and expression, and was republished in England. This was followed by his 'Miscellanies,' in 1850, and in 1851 by two

volumes, His 'Religious Progress' and his 'Lectures on the Lord's Prayer.' At a later date he published 'God's Rescues,' an exposition of Luke 15; his 'Lectures on Baptist History,' in 1876; and his last work, 'Heroes and Characters in History.' His scattered discourses, introductions to the publications of others, his contributions to reviews, and other articles, are very numerous; besides, he has left a large number of manuscripts, amongst them several courses of lectures, ready for publication. All his writings are so thoroughly marked by a glowing diction and a profundity of thought that his image is left on every page. At times a play of humor or a stroke of sarcasm is indulged, indicating great power of invective had he chosen to use it freely but, best of all, he breathes that atmosphere of holiness which only comes of a close walk with God. Dr. Williams died in great peace in the bosom of his family April 1st, 1885, leaving a widow, the daughter of the late John Bowen, and two sons; all of whom are specially devoted to Christian toil in the Amity Street Church, to whose interests their father and husband gave his singularly valuable and honored life.

When our Churches were first awakened to the missionary appeal, Luther Rice, Dr. Staughton and others took it into their heads that the Triennial Convention could unite a great institution of learning at Washington with Foreign Mission work, and so high education could go hand in hand with high evangelization. Hence, in May, 1817, the Convention resolved 'to institute a classical and theological seminary,' to train young men for the ministry. The first idea of Luther Rice was, that as the Burman missionaries must translate the Scriptures from the originals such an institution would give them the necessary training. Dr. Judson was a graduate of Brown University, and with Mr. Rice, had received his theological education at Andover, under the tuition of

Moses Stuart. But soon the purpose enlarged its proportions under the enthusiasm of the measure, in the hands of its friends. They did not foresee that this enterprise must necessarily divert the body from the intention of its founders. Yet for a time great interest was elicited throughout the Middle and Southern States in this two-fold object, until it was discovered that the cause of education threatened to undermine interest in missions. The scheme was to obtain a charter which should provide that the President of the United States, or the heads of Departments, nominate a College Board for election by the Convention, and in due time the college would become such a grand concern as to bring much money into the treasury for various other missionary uses, while the Churches would support the missionaries. These fathers had not the remotest idea of uniting Caesar and Christ in the work of missions, but the scheme was looked upon as specially happy, for utilizing the influence of Caesar in the cause of Christ without being dictated to by him. This notion floated up and down our ranks from 1817 to 1824, and the vision of abundant young Baptist ministers and missionaries filled many eyes. They were to become students at Washington, to study oratory at the feet of the great Senators of those days, and many predicted that, as pulpit orators, they would eclipse the orators of Greece and Rome, and a new race of Baptist Ciceroes and Demostheneses were to arise who should do wonders.

The Seminary was formally opened in 1818, in Philadelphia, under the charge of Dr. William Staughton and Professor Ira Chase. At first the number of students was two, but it soon increased to twenty, and in April, 1821, the first class, numbering five, was graduated. The same year the institution was removed to Washington, where it became the theological department of the Columbian University, which

had received a charter from Congress in 1821. As some leading minds in the country hoped that the college would become a great rational Baptist University, Luther Rice as zealously solicited funds on its behalf as for the support of missionaries in Burma. Dr. Staughton, the very soul of eloquence, left his pastorate in Philadelphia to take the presidency, other names as immortal were to sustain him as professors, and Professor Knowles became the editor of the *Columbian Star*, with the promise of making it the great Baptist paper of the Continent.

Of course, the whole expectation proved futile. It became evident, at the meeting of the Convention in 1820, that it had undertaken too much, and that the educational interest had detracted from the interest in the missionary cause. In the spring of 1826 the Triennial Convention met with the Oliver Street Church, in New York, and took the entire situation into grave consideration. A host of masters in Israel were present: Cone and Kendrick, Malcom and Maclay, Knowles and Galusha, Semple and Ryland, Staughton and Stow, Chonles and Mercer, Rice and Jeter, Wayland and Sommers, with many more. But strong lines of partisanship began to be drawn, and they were divided about the college. There were several vacancies in the Board of Trustees which the President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, had failed to fill by nominations, and so the hands of the Convention were tied as to the election of trustees. In this strait, Rev. Gustavus F. Davis, of Hartford, Conn., a vigorous young man of about thirty, who could travel day and night by stage, was sent off at full speed to Washington to get the President's nominations. The Convention plunged into discussion, and Mr. Rice was charged with bad management of the whole affair. The leading men of the denomination were drawn into the controversy on one side or the other. Luther Rice was as

honest as the daylight, but he knew nothing of book-keeping, so that the missionary and college accounts were mixed up in a perfect tumble. He was the most disinterested of men, had scarcely allowed himself enough for his daily bread, but no straightforward accounting could be had; nor did it enter the minds of the Convention generally that the whole proceeding was an effort at concentration which was very questionable for Baptists to attempt, looked at from any practical point whatever.

Professor Knowles was one of the clearest-headed and most far-sighted men in that Convention, and soon saw that something was radically askew. Others came to his help, in the hope that this confused state of affairs might be straightened; but little could be done. At last, Mr. Rice also saw that, with all his self-sacrifice, he had made serious blunders of judgment, and with an assertion of honesty of purpose, which every one believed, he threw himself and all his golden visions upon the tender mercies of his brethren. After several had taken part in the debate, which lasted for a long time, Rev. Francis Wayland, then about thirty years of age, and a professor in Union College, took the floor. One who was present describes him then as of a 'large, bony frame, which had not acquired the breadth of muscle of after life, giving him a gaunt, stooping appearance. He was of a dark complexion, black eyes, with a sharp, steady radiance which darted from under the jutting cliffs of eyebrows that protruded a little beyond the facial line. He had a Websterian structure, was majestic rather than elegant, being strong in person and in will, and conscientious. His voice was not smoothly sonorous nor sustained in its volume of sound, but falling at times very low, with an occasional hesitancy of speech.' He accorded the highest honor to all concerned in the complicated affairs of the college and of the mission, and admitted that they had been indefatigable in

their labors of love. But he exploded the idea that two such institutions could co-exist under one management, any more than that two ships could be managed by one crew when chained together in a tempestuous sea; one going down must take the other with it to the bottom. He showed that education in America and missions in Burma were so different in their nature that they must be treated separately; for, instead of the one helping the other, they were mutual hindrances, and he demanded that the union between the two be forever dissolved. His speech was so lucid and convincing that the dream vanished and the Convention ended the complication at once, with all its outcoming perplexities.

In 1827 the Faculty resigned, and for a time instruction was suspended. In after years, however, the institution received the benefactions of distinguished men. Mr. Adams was one of its firm friends, and as a college standing upon its own merits it maintained an existence against great difficulties. The gifts of Hon. W.W. Corcoran, of Washington, were munificent, beginning as early as 1864; but it was not until 1873, under the presidency of Dr. Wellings, that Columbia College received the pledge of Mr. Corcoran, that if its friends would secure \$100,000 for its endowment he would contribute \$200,000 more for the same object. This condition was met, and now, in point of endowment, its existence is permanently assured. At this time Mr. Corcoran's donations have amounted to \$300,000, and although this philanthropist is an Episcopalian he made them with great heartiness, saying: 'I know that I am giving to Baptists, but I have confidence in them.' His beloved sister was the wife of Dr. S. P. Hill, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Baltimore, so that he well understood their sentiments and appreciated their work.

Much has already been said of the establishment of Brown, Madison and other

universities, and it would be especially interesting to trace the rise and progress of each Baptist College in America, but space will not permit. It is, however, most highly promising for the cause of Baptist education in the United States that at present we have 19 institutions for the colored and Indian races, 14 seminaries and high-schools for the co-education of male and female, 27 institutions for female education exclusively, and 6 theological seminaries for the education of our ministry, making in all, weak and strong, old and new, an aggregate of 125 institutions. In these the present statistics show, of male instructors, 556; of female instructors 440; of pupils, 16,426; of students for the ministry, 1,503; the moneyed value of libraries and apparatus, \$777,911; the value of grounds and buildings, \$7,713,713; the amount of endowments, \$7,236,270; the total income, \$1,165,786; the amount of gifts to all in 1885, \$330,303, and the number of books in their libraries, 412,120.

Dr. Sprague, in the historical introduction to the 'Annals of the American Baptist Pulpit,' states that 'the Baptists as a denomination have always attached little importance to human learning as a qualification for the ministry, in comparison with higher, though not miraculous, spiritual gifts, which they believe it the province of the Holy Spirit to impart; and some of them, it must be acknowledged, have gone to the extreme of looking upon high intellectual culture in a minister as rather a hindrance than a help to the success of his labors. But, if I mistake not, many of the sketches in this column will show that the Baptists have had less credit as the friends and patrons of learning than they have deserved.' All true Baptists are grateful to say that there has been a great change for the better since Dr. Sprague penned these words, and its stimulant has been drawn largely from the example of the olden times, as well as from the necessities of later days. It

should not be forgotten that it was Thomas Hollis, a Baptist of London, in 1719, who founded two professorships and ten scholarships for 'poor students,' in Harvard College. The Philadelphia Association, in 1722, proposed that the Churches make inquiry for young men 'hopeful for the ministry and inclinable to learning,' and notified Abel Morgan thereof, that he might recommend them to Mr. Hollis for these scholarships. A Baptist Education Society was formed at Charleston, S.C., in 1775, by Rev. Oliver Hart, and in 1789 the Philadelphia Association gathered a fund 'for the education of young men preparing for the Gospel ministry,' the Warren Association did the same in 1793. The American Baptists had three classical schools in 1775, that at Hopewell, N.Y.; that at Wrentham, Mass.; and that at Bordentown, N.J. It was customary at that time for older pastors to instruct students for the ministry, especially in doctrinal and homiletic studies. For example, Dr. Sharp spent considerable time in study with Dr. Staughton; Dr. Bolles studied three years with Dr. Stillman, 'uniting study with observation and labors in the social meetings.' The nucleus of Waterville College was formed in the students whom Dr. Chaplin took with him there from Danvers, where they had studied with him.

The efforts that were made in Rhode Island and New York in behalf of general and theological education have already been traced. When the War of Independence closed, Rhode Island College had existed twelve years, and had graduated seven classes. Small sums had been contributed for its support, by numerous friends in England and America; but, in 1804, Nicholas Brown gave \$5,000 to establish a professorship of oratory and belles-lettres, and, in recognition of his timely gift, its name was changed to Brown University. He died in 1841, at which time he had given about \$100,000 to the institution. Its line of presidents and

instructors has formed for it an illustrious history. Manning, Maxey, Messer, Wayland, Sears, Caswell and Robinson, have honored its presidency and made its influence world-wide. Francis Wayland, D.D., LL.D., one of the great educators of our country, has left a name and influence which must ever stimulate the American student, and call forth the thanksgiving of the denomination to which he was united. Judge Durfee pronounces him: 'A mind of extraordinary calibre, foremost in every good cause, educational, industrial, philanthropical or reformatory, and prompt to answer every call upon him for counsel or instruction in every crisis or exigency.'

FRANCIS WAYLAND was born in New York, March 11, 1796, and was the son of Francis Wayland, a Baptist minister, who preached in several cities on the Hudson and became pastor of the Church at Saratoga Springs in 1819. His son graduated at Union College at the age of seventeen, and commenced the study of medicine, but before his medical studies were completed he believed that the Spirit of God had called him to the Gospel ministry, and entered Andover Theological Seminary in 1816. At the end of a year, however, he became a tutor in Union College, where he remained for four years, when, in 1821, he was called to the pastorate of the First Church in Boston. Here he became known as a man of clear and positive convictions and great moral force. A sermon preached in 1823, on the Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise, and another in 1825, on the Duties of an American Citizen, attracted almost universal attention from the weight of their thought and the charms of their expression. He returned to Union College in 1826, as professor; but in 1827 accepted the presidency of Brown University. At that time Brown was not in a very flourishing condition, either in its finances or reputation for discipline,

but Dr. Wayland soon restored it to a better state, raised its instruction to a new and higher level, and by his stimulating and suggestive methods sought to make it fulfil the ends of a University abreast of any institution in the land. To him is due the inception of the idea that a liberal education should include more than drill in the classics and in mathematics, as modern life demanded more of the liberally educated man than an entry into the learned professions through the traditional curriculum. He thought a system of elective studies necessary, in which the tastes of the student should be consulted while intellectual discipline should be secured, and that the true conception of an American University demanded this. These views were slowly matured, for they were not fully elaborated and wrought into the life of the College until 1850. But the standard of scholarship was slowly raised, the endowment was increased, and he sent forth men with what was better even than scholarship – with the high character that can best be imparted by personal contact with a morally strong, resolute and sympathetic Christian manhood. Dr. Wayland's influence on his students was so familiar, dignified and paternal, and withal so thoroughly Christ-like, that he left his imprint upon each mind, and, whether they became Christians or not while passing through their college course, each one honored the president as a noble specimen of Christ's best disciples, and was convinced that his heart's wish was that all of them might even be better Christians than he esteemed himself to be.

Dr. Wayland, with all his solidity, was of a very mirthful character, and constantly kept his class-room and social surroundings alive with strokes of wit. But his greatest characteristic was his deep and glowing spirituality. Dr. Stockbridge, who supplied the pulpit of the First Church at Providence while Dr. Wayland's pastor was abroad, says of him that one day a

leading Deacon in the city noticed an aged man bowed down in a place of worship and Dr. Wayland leaning over him in close conversation. He drew near, and found the venerable Judge P. overwhelmed with sorrow for sin. He was expressing his fear that, as one who had lived so many scores of years without God in the world, there was no hope in his case. The Doctor was tenderly pointing him to the boundless mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and the eminent jurist found peace in believing on him. In 1853 Dr. Wayland said to Dr. Stockbridge: 'If you can secure the presence of the Holy Spirit in your ministrations, a battalion of soldiers would not be able to keep the people from crowding the sanctuary.' This great educator died August 19th, 1874, but is still preaching by his books in all parts of the civilized world. His published writings of note number seventy-two, the most prominent of which are his 'Moral Science,' 'Political Economy,' 'Intellectual Philosophy,' 'University Sermons,' 'Memoir of Dr. Judson,' 'Limitations to Human Responsibility,' and 'Principles and Practices of the Baptist Churches.'

REUBEN A. GUILD, LL.D., the present Librarian of Brown, has been longer associated with the University than any person now filling an important position in its service, for his labor runs through the terms of its last three presidents and well back into that of Dr. Wayland's, he having filled his office for thirty-eight years. Dr. Guild was born at West Dedham, Mass.; in 1832. From a child he evinced strong literary tastes, and prepared for college at Day's Academy, Wrentham, and at the Worcester High School, entering Brown University in 1843. He was a diligent and faithful student, and graduated in 1847 with the sixth honors of his class. In 1848 he succeeded Professor Jewett as Librarian, and has filled the position with marked success down to this time. Under his administration the library has

increased from 17,000 to 63,000 bound volumes, and 20,000 unbound pamphlets; which collection is kept in a substantial and elegant fire-proof building; constructed after his own plan. No man is fit for a Librarian who will not take off his hat in the presence of a good book. Dr. Guild possesses this ability, together with his other great qualifications. The day after this new building was finished he began to remove the books into it from Manning Hall. Dr. Guild devoutly uncovered his head, took a splendid copy of Bagster's 'Polyglot Bible,' and accompanied by his corps of assistants, led by the late Rev. Prof. J.L. Diman, carried it alone and placed it as No. 1, in alcove 1, on shelf 1, pronouncing it: 'The Book of books, the embodiment of all true wisdom, the fountain-head of real culture, the corner-stone of a true library, the source of all true civilization and moral improvement.' There it stands today, the ripe sheaf of Jehovah, and all the other books must do it reverence if they wish the good-will of the Librarian. The library is a model in its arrangement and management, brought as nearly to perfection as such a collection of books can be. Dr. Guild is one of the best Baptist writers of the times; he is clear, terse, accurate. In 1858 he published the 'Librarian's Manual' and the 'Life of President Manning,' in 1864 the 'History of Brown University,' in 1867 the 'Life of Roger Williams,' and in 1885 the 'Life of Hezekiah Smith, D.D.,' and he has edited a number of books besides. At present he is preparing a complete edition of the 'Works of Roger Williams,' with a Memoir, which altogether will comprise two volumes, large 8vo, with copious indexes. In addition to his vast amount of literary work, Dr. Guild has long acted as a private tutor, for seven years he served as a member of the Common Council of Providence, and for fifteen years as a member of the Common School Committee of that city.

He has visited and examined many of the libraries of Europe, and rendered great service to the cause of education in many capacities. Dr. Guild was baptized by the late Dr. Stow, of Boston; he received his honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Shurtleff College, he is as genial and thorough a Baptist as Rhode Island affords, and is an honor to his denomination. Justice demands that something be said here of another noble educator, who possesses many of the elements which marked Dr. Wayland, and on whom, in an important sense, his mantle has fallen.

MARTIN B. ANDERSON, LL.D., ranks with the most successful educators in our country, he was born in Maine, 1815, and graduated with high honor from Waterville College in 1840, when he entered the Theological Seminary at Newton. In a year from that time he was chosen Professor of Latin, Greek and Mathematics, in Waterville, and in 1843 filled the chair of Rhetoric also in the same institution. He continued there as a broad, earnest and accomplished teacher, until 1850, when he became the proprietor and editor of the 'New York Recorder,' a weakly religious paper of large influence. In 1853 he accepted the presidency of Rochester University, where he has done his great life-work. His entire mastery of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Ancient History and Political Economy, not only opened to him a wide range of practical usefulness as an educator and a scientific explorer, in their correlated branches, but he has done most valuable work for the State as a publicist, especially in adjusting its public charities and educational plans. He has cheerfully placed his facile pen, his store of literary attainments, and his executive ability, under perpetual contribution to the public good. As an orator, a tutor, an essayist and a philanthropist he has served his fellow-men, and all his work bears the stamp of incisive

originality. Few men have so constantly met American wants by articles of every sort, in journals, reviews, encyclopedias and reports on difficult questions, as President Anderson. Yet, few of these productions have been purely speculative. Always he keeps in view, and succeeds in commanding, that vigor of thought and directness of action which produce practical results in others, and especially on social and religious subjects. His whole being is organized on that economic plan which infuses himself into others, and stimulates the best impulses of all around him to emulate his examples and walk in his footsteps. In latter years, no man amongst American Baptists has done more to enlist its energies in our higher educational aims or has sacrificed so much to put them on a firm basis. God has blessed him with a mind and heart of the largest order, with a strong physical frame full of endurance, and with a vital ambition to bless men; nor has he spared himself at any point to secure this end. As the first President of Rochester University, his career has been wonderfully successful. He went to it in its weakness, and now its grounds and buildings are valued at \$379,189, and its endowment amounts to \$442,757, with a promising future; for he has enstamped its character with high attributes, and interwoven his influence with its coming history as effectively as with that which is past. His weight and worth, as a public benefactor who dares to bless others at great cost to himself, will stimulate coming generations through these who have sat at his feet as well as through his invigorating literary productions.

JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D. Born in Culpeper County, Va., January 24th, 1827. He is an alumnus of the University of Virginia, having taken his Master's Degree in 1850. He served as tutor of Latin and Greek in that institution in 1851-52, after which he passed eight years as pastor of the Baptist Church at

Charlottesville. In 1854 he was elected professor of Homiletics and New Testament interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, then located at Greenville, S.C., which high position he still fills in the same school; now located at Louisville, Ky. Dr. Broadus is quite as much wedded to the pulpit as to the class-room. While at Greenville he preached to several small Churches in that vicinity, as their pastor. He is a thorough scholar, a delightful preacher and a finished writer. So deliberate are his methods of work whether in the study, the seminary, or the pulpit, that all forms of labor appear easy to him. Yet his nature is intense, his convictions lay hold of all his powers, and his entire being is thrown into whatever he does. His quiet manner carries the impression to cultured minds that it springs from the behest of high intellect, answering the command of a mellow spirituality, and so it gives double force to his teaching and preaching. The severe drill of his life speaks without the least pretension. His works on preaching are plain, clear and profound, laying bare that art of splendid pulpit work of which he is so fine an example himself. His 'Treatise on Homiletics,' now a text-book on both sides of the Atlantic, stands side by side with his 'Lectures on the History of Preaching,' and makes him a teacher of teachers. To his other attainments he has added the benefits of travel in Europe and Asia, and his letters demonstrate his keen sense of discrimination. In private life he is winsome and unostentatious to a proverb, full of unaffected kindness and playful amiability. Children and sages equally love to gather around him, that they may listen to his humor and pathos; and the more eager are they, because he never indulges these at the sacrifice of common sense or the solid simplicities of truth. Publicly and privately, out of the abundance of a true heart, he speaks in the freedom of truth unmingled with guile, or

with the least tendency to that petty detraction which fatally blights many otherwise noble spirits in the Gospel ministry.

This chapter may be appropriately closed by a sketch of WILLIAM CATHCART, D.D. He has made the denomination his debtor by his patient investigations and literary contributions. His scholarly attainments and tireless industry have fitted him to do an order of literary work which no Baptist had done, in giving the world his 'Baptist Encyclopaedia.' Endowed with a thoroughly analytical mind, his studies have laid bare to him the radical extremes of Gospel interpretation used by the Roman Catholic and the Baptist. He has given the result in his 'Papal System' and 'Baptism of the Ages.' Having explored the philosophy of the Romish system fully in the one, he gives its direct opposite in the other. Dr. Cathcart was born in Londonderry, Ireland, November 8th, 1826, and was brought up a Presbyterian. Surrounded by the religious contests of his nation and times, Ireland forced its contrasts upon his attention from childhood. He was fitted for college by private classical tutors, but took his literary course in the University of Glasgow. On becoming a Christian, the difference between the Presbyterians and Baptists was forced on his attention when at the age of twenty, and his convictions led him to forsake the religion of his fathers. He was baptized on the confession of Christ, at Tubbermore, by Rev. R.H., son of Dr. Alexander Carson. His theological course was taken at Horton College, under the presidency of the late Dr. Ackworth. In 1850 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church at Barnsley, but was so uneasy under the English yoke of Church and State that in 1853 he left a prosperous pastorate to settle in America. The first pastoral charge which he took here was at Mystic, Conn., where he remained till 1857, when he became pastor of the Second Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

He remained in this Church for eight-and-twenty years; doing such an excess of work that at last a constitution of uncommon strength began to break under the load, and he was obliged to retire to prevent utter prostration. Not only did his congregation in Philadelphia double in size, but it became necessary to build a large and beautiful sanctuary in a new location to accommodate the increase. His people loved him almost to idolization, and gave him up with the utmost reluctance. In 1872 he published his 'Papal System;' in 1876, His 'Baptists and the American Revolution;' a monograph, on that subject, without a rival; in 1878, his 'Baptism of the Ages,' and his 'Encyclopaedia' in 1881. Having known Dr. Cathcart in intimate friendship for a full generation, his habits of study, his unflagging perseverance, and his uncompromising integrity, the writer is free to express the belief that no truer man lives in our Baptist brotherhood. As an eloquent preacher, a true friend, an honest man and a careful scholar, those who know him best regret the most his retirement in the prime of his manhood, as a serious loss in our effective ranks, he is but another example amongst us of the common sacrifice which our ministry makes to the strain of overwork.

It is a re-assuring consideration that these Christian leaders, in company with the great body of Baptist ministers in America, hold fast to the old Gospel faith. The Philadelphia Association was troubled at its New York session, held there October 5th and 7th, 1790, by a question from the Church at Stamford, asking whether or not it should fellowship those who held the 'new system of divinity.' The Association answered in the negative, denouncing 'these fine-spun theories' in detail. Then the body passed this minute: 'This Association lament they have occasion again to call the attention of that part of Zion we represent to another awful instance of departure

from the faith once delivered unto the saints; Mr. Nicholas Cox, late a brother in the ministry, having espoused, and artfully as well as strenuously endeavored to propagate, the fatal notion of the universal restoration of bad men and devils from hell. As such, we caution our Churches, those of our sister Associations and Christian brethren of every denomination, to be aware of him.' Happily our ministry is too seriously engaged in saving men from 'the wrath to come' to give much attention at present to the restoration of lost men and demons from perdition. When they get to heaven they may find time to speculate as to what can be done for those 'in prison,' if God shall call them there to that order of thought. But while they are filling their present pastorates amongst the lost

sons of Adam's race, their chief duty to their Master and to 'bad men' is to cry 'Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world!' As ministers of Christ, sent to save wicked men, 'pulling them out of the fire,' as Jude expresses himself, it is quite as absurd to spend their strength in this controversy as it would be for twin chicks in one shell to fight over the question whether the outside world is all yolk or all white. It is simply shameful that a man intrusted with the care of immortal souls should be obliged to say to his Master, of one of them, 'As thy servant was busy here and there, arguing that if he should be consigned to perdition he will finally be rescued, lo! he was gone!'

The American Baptists

Chapter 16 - Theological Seminaries – Literature – Revivals

Perhaps sufficient has been said already about the early efforts of the Baptists to provide facilities for general and theological education, but there is a disposition to linger and contemplate the great contrast presented between the firmly laid foundations and the present state of the structure. As early as 1813 a charter was obtained for the Maine Literary and Theological Institution, and in 1818 a school was opened at Waterville, under the charge of Jeremiah Chaplin, D.D., who for several years had been giving theological instruction to a few young men who had removed with him to Waterville from his pastorate at Danvers, Mass. In 1820 this school was incorporated as a college, with both a collegiate and a theological department, but when Newton Institution was opened, instruction in divinity was discontinued and the institution grew into what is now Colby University. The spread of Baptist principles in this country is nowhere more strongly seen than by our present educational statistics. The State of New York is a fair example. In 1817 there were only three educated Baptist ministers in that State, west of the Hudson. Thirteen men met at the house of Deacon Jonathan Olmstead, in Hamilton, September 24th, 1817, and contributed \$13 to the cause of theological education in founding what has now become Madison University, and the first class which graduated from the infant institution numbered but six members. Today, 1886, the property and endowments of the Baptist institutions of learning in New York are estimated at \$2,133,000. The Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution was opened on May 1st, 1820. Its first Professor was Rev. Daniel Hascall, and in the following fall, Elder Nathanael Kendrick, of Eaton, was employed to visit the school and lecture on moral philosophy and theology three times a week. The first

regular class in Divinity was organized under his instruction, in June, 1822. Two members of this class were Jonathan Wade and Eugenio Kincaid, both of whom went on missions to Burma.

Gradually, the length of the course of study was extended and its variety enlarged, until in 1839 the restriction to candidates for the ministry was widened, granting the privileges of the institution to 'students of good moral character not having the ministry in view.' This enlargement, however, was accompanied by the provisions that: 'No change should be made in the course of instruction to favor such students, that they should in no case exceed the number of those preparing for the ministry, and that in no other way should the privileges of the latter be abridged by reason of this arrangement.' The institution was supported by contributions from the Churches and by the help of the Education Society. By degrees which it is not necessary to trace here, it became the Madison University of today, having had a rare succession of Professors and graduates. Dr. Kendrick, who had been its head till 1836, was at that time formally elected its President, in which capacity he continued until 1848. Stephen W. Taylor, LL.D., became its second President in 1851, but died in 1856. Dr. Taylor was a layman of very high character. He graduated at Hamilton College, Clinton Co., N.Y., and had devoted his life to teaching. For two years he acted as principal of the academy connected with the University, but left in 1836, after which he founded the Lewisburg University, in Pennsylvania, and returned as President of Madison. Rev. George W. Eaton, D.D., LL.D., was the third President of this renowned institution. He was a graduate of Union College and had devoted his life to teaching, his first professorship being that of Ancient Languages, at Georgetown, Ky. He became Professor of

The American Baptists

Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, at Hamilton, in 1833, was elected to the chair of Ecclesiastical and Civil History, in 1837; in 1850 he became Professor of Systematic Theology and President of Madison University, in 1856 Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, and in 1861 he was chosen President of Hamilton Seminary and Professor of Homiletics. He died August 3d, 1872, at the age of 68 years, having been connected with the Institution in one capacity or another for forty years, in prosperity and adversity, until its interests and history became a part of himself and the chief end of his existence. Dr. Eaton would have been a man of mark in any sphere of life. In body, intellect and soul, he possessed a uniform greatness, which, without exaggeration, entitle him to the appellation of a threefold giant. He knew nothing of cowardice, moral or otherwise, but met every issue which arose in the affairs of the denomination and the times, on the high and broad plane of Christian manliness. His first and last question on all subjects was, 'Is this right?' When that question was determined in his own mind his position was taken, whether he stood alone or with the multitude. His memory was what he would have called 'prodigious,' his eloquence massive, his hospitality warm, and his convictions of duty as deep as his nature. Withal, his sympathy with the weak, the wronged and the suffering, was extraordinary. He was as artless as a child, and his unsuspecting nature was often imposed upon, while he gave his strong arm to help every one. He was too impulsive for a thorough disciplinarian and too pure for any one to despise.

EBENEZER DODGE, D.D., LL.D., the fourth President of Madison University, is a native of Massachusetts, born at Salem, April 21, 1819. He is an alumnus of Brown University and studied theology at Newton. He served as pastor of the Baptist Church in New

London, N.H., for seven years, with marked power, but was called from his pastorate to the chair of Christian Theology in 1853. In 1868 he was elected President of Madison University and in 1871 President of Hamilton Theological Seminary. He is a ripe scholar and a profound theologian. Under his administration the career of the University has been one unbroken progress; for it has enjoyed the greatest prosperity in its history in all its departments, so that it never occupied the commanding position which it does at this time. Dr. Dodge has contributed to the standards of Theology in his work on the 'Evidences of Christianity,' and his 'Theological Lectures,' now confined to the use of his students, exhibit the hand of a master in deep thought and ripe scholarship. He has many valuable manuscripts ready for the press, which, it is believed, will stand side by side with his present publications, and, as they are the results of his life-long experience, may even excel them in their advanced value.

The Newton Theological Institution has a most interesting history. At a large meeting of ministers and laymen held in Boston, May 25th, 1825, it was resolved that a Baptist Theological Institution in the vicinity of Boston was a necessity, and the Massachusetts Baptist Educational Society was requested to take steps in that direction. Its executive committee fixed upon Newton Center for a location, and selected Rev. Irah Chase to begin instruction. The foundations of the school were laid with great difficulty and in much faith and prayer. Students increased faster than the necessary provisions for their reception, and heavy debts were incurred. It was many years before its permanent endowment was secured with corresponding success. All connected with the undertaking made great sacrifices, and Dr. Chase gave twenty years of his valuable life to the enterprise with an unselfishness that has laid the Baptists of New England under a debt

which they will never be able to discharge. The course of instruction was to cover three years, and to be specially adapted to college graduates familiar with the Latin and the Greek. Dr. Chase commenced his work in the autumn of 1825, and in the next year Prof. Henry J. Ripley was added. Prof. James D. Knowles came to their aid in 1834, Rev. Barnas Sears in 1836, and in 1838, upon the death of Prof. Knowles, Prof. Hackett left his chair in Brown University to take his place in the corps of tutors. Not far from 800 students have gone forth from its hallowed bosom to fill places of high trust, and under its present faculty it is doing, if possible, better work than ever and promises a splendid future.

ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., LL.D., its President, is a native of Greene, Chenango Co., N.Y., and was born March 5th, 1820. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1844, and spent three years at Newton as a theological student. After preaching for a year, in 1849 he first became a tutor in Hebrew, at Newton; and then in succession, Professor of Church History, Theology, and Christian Ethics, and President; so, that, for thirty-seven years he has consecrated all his energies to the training of young ministers in this renowned seminary. This long experience, governed by a sacred regard for divine truth and by a remarkably sound judgment in expounding its principles, has made his tuition far-reaching, and given to our Churches a fullness of doctrine and devotion which has been strong and abiding. Dr. Hovey is distinguished for his clear perception of Gospel doctrines, to which he cleaves simply because they are divinely true. First of all he is just, which renders his aims high and unselfish, besides making his counsels sensible and sound. His pen has been ever busy; he is the author of about a dozen volumes, amongst which are his 'Person and Work of Christ,' the 'Miracles,' his 'Higher Christian

Life,' and his 'Memoirs of Dr. Backus,' all valuable productions. This veteran educator is beloved and trusted by the Churches everywhere, as far as he is known, and his present vigor promises to bless them for many years to come.

The third Theological Seminary founded by the American Baptists was that at Rochester, N.Y. About 1847 many friends of Madison University thought its usefulness would be greatly increased, by its removal from the village of Hamilton to a more populous center. After considerable controversy, and some litigation, the question of its removal was abandoned. The University of Rochester was founded in 1850, and in the following November a Theological Seminary was organized, distinct, however, in its property and government. From the first, its list of instructors has comprised the names of very eminent scholars. Its first two professors were Thomas J. Conant, D.D., and John S. Maginnis, D.D.; Ezekiel G. Robinson, D.D., LL.D., became its President in 1868, after most valuable service as professor from 1853. In 1872 he was elected President of Brown University, when Rev. Augustus H. Strong, D.D., was chosen to fill his position both as President and Professor of Biblical Theology at Rochester. This school has been liberally endowed and has given to the Churches a succession of pastors of the highest stamp for excellency in every respect. Its German Department was early enriched by the library of Neander, and its buildings have been provided by the munificence of J.B. Trevor, Esq., of New York, and John D. Rockefeller, Esq., of Cleveland. Hon. R.S. Burrows, of Albion; John M. Bruce, J.A. Bostwick and William Rockefeller, Esqs., of New York, have given large sums to replenish its library, and a host of other friends have carried its interests to a high state of prosperity by their Christian benefactions.

The American Baptists

DR. STRONG, its President, was born at Rochester, August 3d, 1836, and graduated from Yale College in 1857. While a student at Yale he was brought to Christ, and united with the First Baptist Church in Rochester; but after his graduation he first entered the Theological Seminary in that city, and then completed his studies in the German universities. On his return from Europe, in 1861, he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church at Haverhill, Mass., which he left in 1865 to become pastor of the First Church, Cleveland, OH., from whence he went to take his present place, after seven years of successful pastoral toil. Although Dr. Strong is the youngest of our theological presidents, the classes which come from under his hand evince his care in training and his wisdom in impressing them with that robust impress of Biblical theology which betokens their reverence for the heavenly vision. Endowed himself with insight into spiritual things, with keen faith and high sanctity, they catch his spirit, and their ministry evidences their love for that Lord whose they are and whom they serve. He is the author of numerous notable articles on theological subjects, but his most elaborate and weighty book is his 'Systematic Theology' recently published. It is a work of great research, indicating the strength and solidity, as well as the logical and analytical power, of the author's mind.

Having already spoken of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, it is not necessary to treat of its interests here, further than to speak of its President, who is in all respects the peer of his presidential brethren.

JAMES P. BOYCE, D.D., LL.D., was born in Charleston, S.C. January 11th, 1827. In 1847 he graduated from Brown University, and, having been converted while in college, he was baptized in 1848 by the Rev. Dr. Richard Fuller. From 1848 to 1851 he studied theology

at Princeton, N.J. He threw all his energies into his theological studies, and when he was examined for ordination to the ministry, Dr. Curtis, moderator of the examining council, asked him whether he intended to give his life to the preaching of the Gospel. He replied: 'Provided I don't become a professor of theology.' In 1851 he became pastor of the Church at Columbia, S.C., but took the chair of theology in Furman University in 1855. He accepted a professorship in the Theological Seminary at Greenville, S.C., however, in 1858. The seminary being located but temporarily there, in 1873 it was resolved to remove it to Louisville, its friends in Kentucky having offered \$300,000 for its permanent establishment there, provided that \$200,000 could be added from other sources. When financial embarrassment threatened the ruin of this great scheme, Dr. Boyce, who at that time was wealthy, borrowed large sums of money on his own responsibility, and threw his surprising financial talents into the enterprise. For about seven years it seemed as if the godly project must fail, and gloom, almost despair, settled upon the hopes of its friends. But Dr. Boyce by his patience and business skill re-inspired the energies of his brethren, and more than any other person led the movement to complete success. He is a refined and dignified gentleman, whose modest polish of manner, generous culture and varied accomplishments clothe him with a delightful influence in all spheres in which he moves, so that he is pre-eminently fitted to mold his pupils in the proprieties demanded by their calling. Clearly, it must be the fault of the pupil if he goes forth to his work without that refinement of manner, together with that mental and heart culture, which are demanded in the acceptable minister of our Lord Jesus.

The Baptist Union Theological Seminary at Morgan Park, Illinois, was organized in 1867.

Up to about the year 1860 the West had been wholly dependent upon the East for theological education; but in 1859 a convention of delegates representing the West and Northwest gathered in Chicago to consult respecting the establishment of a new seminary in that part of our country. The difference of opinion as to location was so striking that general agreement was not then reached. At length a preliminary organization was effected, in 1860, under the lead of W.W. Everts, D.D., J.B. Oleott, and J.A. Smith, and in 1863 a corporation was formed and officers chosen; Hon. R.S. Thomas being President, Luther Stone, Secretary, and Edward Goodman, Treasurer. In 1865 the Legislature of Illinois granted it a charter. A temporary arrangement was made with Dr. Nathanael Culver to commence theological tuition, but a regular faculty was selected in 1866, and in the autumn of that year the work of instruction began in earnest. Since that time reliable endowments have been received, the faculty has been very effective, the seminary has been removed to Morgan Park, and is in a high state of prosperity. It has already graduated about 500 students. Its beautiful property at Morgan Park, and an endowment of \$200,000, with a library of 25,000 volumes, promise much, with its able body of tutors, for the culture of the rising ministry in the West.

GEORGE W. NORTHRUP, D.D., LL.D., its President, was born in Jefferson County, K.Y., October 15th, 1826, and when but sixteen years of age became a member of the Baptist Church at Antwerp. His early educational advantages were slight, but from childhood he possessed that quenchless thirst for knowledge and culture that refuses to submit to any obstructions which assume to be insurmountable. He plodded on in the study of Latin, Greek and mathematics with such private aids only as he could command, until he was able to enter Williams College. In 1854 he

graduated from that institution with the highest honors, and in 1857 finished a theological course at the Rochester Seminary. There, also, he served with distinguished ability as Professor of Church History for ten years. He accepted the chair of theology and the presidency in the seminary, which he has done so much to establish, in 1867, and in contending with the difficulties incident to the founding of a new institution he has displayed the qualities of a forceful leader and organizer. His wise methods and strength of will have braved all storms, and commanded that signal success which has given the West as strong and well-conducted a theological seminary as any in the East, in view of its youth. As a metaphysician, pulpit orator and theologian, Dr. Northrup is an honor to his denomination.

The youngest of the six theological schools is the Crozer Theological Seminary, located at Chester, in Pennsylvania, and organized in 1868. The late John P. Crozer, Esq., was deeply interested in ministerial education, and had largely aided therein through the Lewisburg University. After his death his family took up the work where he left it, to give it an enlarged and more permanent form. Led by his eldest son, Mr. Samuel A. Crozer, his other sons and daughters established this seminary as a devout monument to his name, and all generations will therefor call them blessed. The buildings and grounds are spacious, valued at \$150,000; the endowment amounts to about \$350,000, and the library and apparatus are ample for present use, although the library building is planned to contain about 50,000 volumes. William Bucknell, son-in-law to Mr. John P. Crozer, made a donation of about \$30,000 for the purchase of books, and a further sum of \$10,000 was presented from another source for the same purpose. Its average number of pupils is about fifty per year, its faculty is one of the best in the denomination, and it has sent about

The American Baptists

300 men into the Christian ministry; many of whom are now filling places of great influence and responsibility.

HENRY G. WESTON, D.D., has been president of this institution from its foundation, and has contributed greatly to its up-building. He is a native of Lynn, Mass., and was born September 11th, 1820. He graduated at Brown University and Newton Theological Institution, and after sustaining himself for three years as a missionary in Illinois, became pastor of the Baptist Church in Peoria in 1846, where he was prospered for thirteen years. In 1859 he removed to New York city, to take charge of the Oliver Street Baptist Church, in which congregation he remained, first in Oliver Street, and then in Madison Avenue when it removed, until the year 1868, when he took the presidency of Crozer Seminary. His double aim was to give a complete theological training to the alumni of our colleges, who could study the Scriptures in the Greek and pursue the Hebrew; and also to take men who were somewhat advanced in life, but could not command a classical course; to aid them in the knowledge of the Scriptures and in theological studies, that they might be measurably qualified, at least, for their pastoral work. A peculiar order of ability was needed in the president who than well lay the foundations of such a school, not only must he be a true scholar, and a clear, sound and experienced theologian, broad in his views, simple in his habits, kind in his disposition, and devout in his piety; but quite as much he needed unflinching courage in his convictions. In a word, all the ripe qualities of manly experience were needed, with the forbearance and tenderness of a woman. Even then, the tact of a general was required, who knew the wants of the place and had the genius to meet them. Many men were scanned as to this fitness, but, with singular unanimity, Dr. Weston was hailed as the one man for the post. A ripe scholar and

a pulpit master, it was believed that he could equally develop the immature and perfect the accomplished. The result has so far exceeded sanguine expectation, that all true Baptist hearts thank him for his work and praise his Master for the gift of the workman. For nearly a score of years he has been filling the pulpits of our land with men who are blessing it everywhere. The Baptist denomination, having possessed such a succession of men in the presidency of its seminaries, should be grateful indeed, for not one of them, from the establishment of the first school, has ever brought a stain upon its fair fame. And not only in view of the past, but in the necessities of the present, it is to be congratulated; happy are the Baptists of the United States in the possession of six such presidents of their theological schools.

American Baptists have lately paid much attention to female education, and have twenty-seven institutions devoted to this object. A Ladies' Institute was founded at Granville, Oh., in 1832, which was followed by the Judson Female Institute, at Marion, Ala., in 1839; by Baylor Female College, at Independence, Tex., in 1845; and by the Female Seminary at Georgetown, Ky., in 1846. Mary Sharp College was established, on a somewhat larger scale, at Winchester, Term., in 1851. But the largest and most thoroughly endowed Baptist institution for females is Vassar College, at Poughkeepsie, N.Y. It was founded by Matthew Vassar, in 1865, at a cost of \$700,000. He excluded sectarian teaching, but put it under Baptist control, forbidding that its training should ever be 'intrusted to the skeptical, the irreligious or the immoral.' Its endowment is \$430,000, and it exerts a great influence on the higher education of women. Its presidents have been John H. Raymond, LL.D.; S.L. Caldwell, D.D.; J.R. Kendrick, D.D.; and its present head, James M. Taylor, D.D., son of the late Dr. E.E.I. Taylor.

The growth of a distinctively

denominational literature in America has been closely kindred to the growth of the denomination and of its schools for education. From the antecedents of Baptist European life, under all its persecutions and disabilities, it was scarcely to be expected that Baptists would take any very prominent part in literature here. Still, it is one of the marvels of English literary history that the two men of the seventeenth century whom Macaulay pronounces 'creative minds' were decided Baptists in their religious convictions. He writes: 'We are not afraid to say that though there were many clever men in England during the latter part of the seventeenth century, there were only two great creative minds. One of these produced "Paradise Lost," and the other "Pilgrim's Progress."' Milton spent his strength in his two most extensive prose works in proving that those principles which distinguish the Baptists are drawn from the Scriptures; while Bunyan was a Baptist preacher, imprisoned for preaching at Baptist conventicles. As might have been expected, the writings of Baptists, both in the Old and New World, took a decidedly controversial tone. Roger Williams possessed high literary art, viewed in the ponderous style of his day, and advocated principles which are now universally conceded in the United States. His success in obtaining the charter, and the friendly admonition from England to the authorities of Massachusetts that they should be less severe with him, are justly attributed to the favorable impressions as to his purposes and spirit created in England by his writings, especially those in regard to the Indians. The occasion for the composition of the important works by which he is best known was furnished by the principle which he maintained against Mr. Cotton. Five volumes, of which the 'Bloody Tenet' is the most noted, were published in London between the years 1644 and 1652; after the death of Cotton,

Williams ceased to write upon these subjects. But the battle which he fought has long since been decided. Despite the grudging reluctance of those who hate his memory for his religious principles, and the tardy acknowledgment of his great power by those who hold those principles themselves yet accuse him of inconsistency in their maintenance, the fact is clear that the tenets for which he contended so manfully against Cotton have incorporated themselves into all American institutions.

Clarke, the founder of Newport, published a small volume on the persecutions in New England, but, so far as is known, the first Baptist theological work printed in America was a Catechism by John Watts, of Pennepeck Church, in 1700. The next bears the following title, with an address to the reader, dated 'Providence, the 17th of February, 1718-19' –

'REPLY to the Most Principal Arguments contained in a Book, Entitled "*The Baptism of the Holy Spirit without Elementary Water, Demonstratively proved to be the true Baptism of Christ.*" Signed, William Wilkinson. In which REPLY his arguments are fairly Refuted; and both WATER BAPTISM and the LORD'S SUPPER plainly proved to be the commands of JESUS CHRIST, and to continue in force until His Second Personal Coming. By *Joseph Jenks*. Printed in the year 1719.'

Valentine Wightman published a volume on Baptism in 1728, which was the outcome of a debate on that subject. In 1730, a 'Concordance to the Bible' in the Welsh language was published by Rev. Abel Morgan, which was largely used in the vicinity of Philadelphia. The historical discourse of John Callender, pastor of the Church at Newport, delivered in 1738, a hundred years after the founding of that city, has become a classic authority upon Providence and Rhode Island matters. Probably the first sermon published by a Southern Baptist was

Isaac Chanler's, with the title: 'The Doctrines of Glorious Grace enforced, defended, and practically improved.' Boston, 1744. Having already spoken of the writings of Abel Morgan and Samuel Stillman, it is not necessary to mention them here. The history of 'New England Baptists,' by Dr. Backus, has become a standard, and is thoroughly reliable in its general treatment of facts. Its author himself had been actively engaged in the advancement of religious liberty, and especially in awakening a public sentiment to be expressed in legislation against the privileges and immunities accorded to the State Church. Since its first publication it has passed through a number of revisions and in its present form it is indispensable to a full and true history of New England. The works of Backus and Morgan Edwards were used largely by David Benedict, who published the first edition of his 'History of the Baptists' in 1812, a work which he enlarged in 1848 to embrace a sketch of the Baptists not only in every State of the Union but in all parts of the world. This book has passed through many editions, and remains a noble monument to the untiring toil and patience of its author.

During the first half of our national existence the books written by Baptists were, for the most part, intended to instruct Church members in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. The authors and titles of a few of them may be mentioned. Dr. Samuel Jones wrote a 'Treatise of Discipline;' Dr. William Rogers published a work on 'Justification;' Dr. Jeeze Mercer, on 'Various Christian Duties,' and on the 'Unity and Interdependence of the Churches.' President Maxcy wrote largely on the Atonement, one production in which the 'governmental' theory of the Atonement is treated of. Dr. Baldwin's discourse on the 'Deity of Christ,' published in 1812, during the Unitarian Controversy, passed through many editions, as did, also, Dr. Judson's Sermon

preached in Calcutta, in 1812, and republished in America in 1817, in which he defended his course in becoming a Baptist. Numerous tracts, sermons and pamphlets, have been published on Baptism and Communion, and, perhaps, none of them have been more widely circulated or useful than these of the late Rev. Stephen Remington. We greatly need a work on Baptist Bibliography, and another on Baptist hymnology.

So far as is now known, the first Baptist periodical published in America was the 'Analytical Repository,' in Savannah, Ga., by Rev. Henry Holcombe, their pastor of the Church there. Its first issue was for the months of May and June, 1802, and its publication is said to have continued for two years, though the second volume is not known to be extant. The first volume consists of six numbers, the sixth being for March and April, 1803. It was a 12mo, each number containing 48 pages. Its historic value lies chiefly in its account of the general proceedings which led to the organization of the Georgia Baptist State Convention; in its detail of the first efforts toward mitigating the hardship of the Penal Code, petty larceny being at that time a capital crime; in an account of the Savannah Female Orphan Asylum, which was established by Dr. Holcombe, and still exists; in a narrative concerning the founding of the Baptist Church in Savannah, and in a sketch of the colored Baptists in that city, also of several Churches in its vicinity. On the 20th of May, 1802, John Rice was executed in Savannah for stealing a gun, and on the day of his execution Dr. Holcombe took his children to his own house to cherish and comfort them; he then prepared a memorial to the Legislature of Georgia, and procured a milder and more enlightened system of punishment.

Nothing is more honorable to Dr. Henry Holcombe Tucker, the grandson of Dr.

Holcombe, and to the Georgia Baptists, than their protest against all legal disregard of marital relations amongst slaves. At the meeting of the Georgia Association, held at Pine Grove, October 8th, 1864, Dr. Tucker offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted first by that body and afterward by various Associations in the State:

'Resolved, That it is the firm belief and conviction of this body that the institution of marriage was ordained by Almighty God for the benefit of the whole human race, without regard to color; that it ought to be maintained in its original purity among all classes of people, in all countries and in all ages, till the end of time; and that, consequently, the law of Georgia, in its failure to recognize and protect this relationship between our slaves, is essentially defective and ought to be amended.'

The interest awakened in foreign missions in 1814 naturally found expression in the establishment of a periodical to maintain and foster their interests by spreading information and appeals. The first missionary periodical published by the American Baptists was known as the 'Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine,' issued by the Massachusetts Missionary Society in September, 1803, a year after the organization of the society. It was edited by Dr. Baldwin, first as a semi-annual of thirty-two pages, filled with letters and reports from missionaries. In 1817 its numbers were issued once in two months, and in 1825 it was changed to a monthly, and has since been conducted in the interests of Foreign Missions. 'The Macedonian' was started in 1842 for the diffusion of Foreign Mission news. In 1849 the 'Home Mission Record' was started to promote Home Missions, items relating to the subject having before appeared in various religious papers. Its name was changed to the 'Home Evangelist' in 1863 and in 1867, by

arrangement with the Missionary Union, it appeared under the title, 'The Macedonian and Record,' the first leaf containing home and the second foreign missionary intelligence; but, in 1878, the 'Baptist Home Mission Monthly' was commenced, a quarto of sixteen pages which has since been enlarged to twenty-four, and it now reports the work of the Woman's Home Mission Societies. The following newspapers are mentioned after the dates of their establishment:

The oldest Baptist weekly in America is 'THE WATCHMAN,' of Boston, established in 1819, with the title, the 'Christian Watchman,' and edited by Deacon James Loring. The question of slavery becoming a subject of warm discussion, the 'Christian Reflector' was begun at Worcester, Mass., edited by Rev. Cyrus P. Grosvenor. This paper was removed to Boston in 1844, under the editorship of Rev. H.A. Graves, where it obtained a large circulation; but, Mr. Graves's health failing, Rev. J.W. Olmstead became its editor, March, 1846, and in 1848 the two papers were united, under the name, 'The Watchman and Reflector,' Dr. Olmstead remaining as editor. The 'Christian Era' was commenced in Lowell in 1852, but was removed to Boston after several years, and conducted by Dr. Amos Webster, and was merged into 'The Watchman and Reflector' in 1875 when the name of the united papers became 'The Watchman.' Dr. Olmstead resided in New York for a short time, but returned as editor-in-chief of 'The Watchman' in 1882, and now ranks as the senior Baptist editor in the country, having conducted this paper, with a brief interval, for more than forty years. The influence of this journal is very healthful and deservedly wide-spread in New England.

The Connecticut Baptist Missionary Society started the 'Christian Secretary' in 1822, with Elisha Cushman as editor. A succession of editors conducted it until 1858, when Elisha

The American Baptists

Cushman, Jr., assumed charge, continuing it till his death in 1876. Then S. D. Phelps, D.D., who had filled the pastorate of the First Baptist Church at New Haven, under the shadow of Yale College, for thirty years, became its editor, and bus done a most forceful work in making it an indispensable exponent of the principles and progress of the Connecticut Baptists.

The 'CHRISTIAN INDEX,' now published at Atlanta, Ga., had its origin in the 'Columbian Star,' a weekly folio sheet, originated at Washington, D.C., about the year 1822, by Luther Rice, assisted by Dr. Staughton and O.B. Brown; it was devoted principally to the advocacy of foreign missions and education through the Columbian College. It appears to have been first edited by John S. Meehan, assisted by the gentlemen already named, Mr. Brown editing in the same office a monthly called the 'Latter-Day Luminary.' Afterwards, the celebrated Professor J.D. Knowles, then a student in Washington, became its editor, and was succeeded by Baron Stow, then a student also. About the years 1826-28 it was removed to Philadelphia, put under the management of Dr. W.T. Brantly, and issued as a quarto, under the name of 'The Columbian Star and Christian Index.' Late in 1832 or early in 1833 it became the property of Jesse Mercer, who removed it to Georgia and edited it till 1840, when he presented it to the Baptist Convention of that State. William Stokes, who had assisted him, became editor-in-chief and remained in the chair till 1843, when he was followed by Dr. J.S. Baker till 1849. He had several successors, and Rev. Joseph Walker took charge in 1857. Under his careful toil it rose from about 1,000 paying subscribers to nearly 6,000, and yielded \$1,000 annually above its expenses. In 1801 it was sold to Rev. S. Boykin, and Dr. Shaver conducted it from 1867 to 1874. Then Rev. Dr. E. Butler became its editor, serving until 1878, when Dr. Tucker; its present learned chief, took

the editorial chair. As a Baptist organ, it has always been unflinching in its maintenance of Baptist doctrine and practice. It retains the flavor imparted to it by Knowles, Brantly and Mercer, and is conducted with as much ability as it has commanded at any time in its hoary history of four-and-sixty years.

The 'RELIGIOUS HERALD,' of Richmond, Va., was established by William Sands, a layman and an expert printer, in 1828. Like most other things that become of any account, it began its life in the day of small things. Mr. Sands lived in Baltimore, and, on the suggestion of William Crane, went to Richmond to establish a Baptist paper, aided by money furnished by Mr. Crane. For several years Mr. Sands was printer and financial manager, with Rev. Henry Keeling for editor, but the struggle to establish the Journal was severe. Dr. Shaver put his strong hand to the enterprise in 1857, and the paper soon took that high position amongst religious periodicals which it has sustained ever since. William Sands died in 1868, lamented as a most devout Christian, possessed of the soundest judgment, and beloved by all who knew him for his amiable disposition. The establishment of Sands and Shaver was consumed by fire in 1865, and they sold the 'good will' of the paper to Messrs. Jeter and Dickinson. Dr. Jeter devoted fourteen of the ripest years of his life to its up-building, and not in vain. He has left a hallowed influence about its very name, and, under its present energetic management, its weekly blessings help to make bright homes for thousands of Christian families, North and South.

'ZION'S ADVOCATE,' published at Portland, Me., was begun in 1828 with Rev. Adam Wilson as editor, who held this relation to it until 1848, with a short interval. Afterwards it was edited by various men of large capacity, amongst whom were Dr. W.H.

Shailer. In 1873 the paper was purchased by Rev. Henry S. Burrage, its present editor, under whose direction its reputation and influence have been greatly enlarged. It has also been changed by him to its present enlarged size, and kept abreast of the demands of the times, not only in the advocacy of our denominational principles and practices, but in awakening new enthusiasm in the cause of education amongst our Churches in Maine. The sound judgment and careful scholarship with which it is conducted render it worthy of its high place in our periodical press.

The 'JOURNAL AND MESSENGER,' published at Cincinnati, Oh., originated in the 'Baptist Weekly Journal' of the Mississippi Valley, in 1831. In 1834 the 'Cross,' a Baptist paper of Kentucky, was united with it, and seven years later it was removed to Columbus, Oh., with Messrs. Cole, Randall and Batchelor as editors. The 'Christian Messenger' was united with it in 1850, under the name of the 'Journal and Messenger.' It then changed owners and editors several times, until it was purchased, in 1876, by G.W. Lasher, D.D., by whom it has been edited since in a vigorous manner; its circulation has become large, and it well cultivates its important field.

'THE WESTERN RECORDER.' Various attempts were made to establish a Baptist paper in Kentucky, but failed until the 'Baptist Banner' originated at Shelbyville in 1835. At that time it was a fortnightly; but in 1835 Rev. John N. Waller became its editor; when it was removed to Louisville and issued as a weekly. Soon it was united with the 'Baptist,' which was published at Nashville, Tenn., and with the 'Western Pioneer,' of Illinois, becoming the 'Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer.' In 1841 Mr. Waller ceased to be its editor, and was succeeded by Rev. W.C. Buck; but in 1850 Mr. Waller returned to the paper, aided by Rev. S. H. Ford, and in 1851 its name was changed to

the 'Western Recorder.' Dr. Waller died in 1854, and Mr. Ford became its sole editor and proprietor; but, after a time, it passed into other hands until 1858. During a part of the civil war its issue was suspended, but it was resumed in 1863, when it was owned and edited by various persons till about 1872; then A.C. Caperton, D.D., became its solo owner and editor. It had never fully paid its way until that time, but he changed its form from a quarto to an octavo, and enlarged its size about one third, he also employed paid contributors and a field editor, and it steadily grew in power, popularity and financial value, until it is now regarded as one of the leading journals of the South.

'THE TENNESSEE BAPTIST' was established under the name 'The Baptist,' at Nashville, Tenn., in the year 1835; two or three years after that it was consolidated with the 'Western Baptist and Pioneer,' and was edited by the late Dr. Howell and others; but its circulation barely crept up to 1,000 copies until, in 1846, it fell into the hands of Dr. J.R. Graves, its present editor. It then assumed its present name, and, under his persevering and energetic management, its circulation increased rapidly and became very large. During the civil war its publication was suspended. At its close the paper was removed to Memphis, the word 'Tennessee' dropped from its name, and its circulation, as a quarto of sixteen pages, has again readied a high figure. Dr. Graves is endowed with marked qualifications for an editor. As a writer and speaker he is remarkably direct and copious, like all men in downright earnest, infusing his spirit and principles into the minds of his constant readers and hearers. Restless and aggressive, his pen is ever busy, not only as an editor, leaving his own stamp upon his paper, but as an author his works teem from the press perpetually in the form of books and pamphlets. His life has been devoted with quenchless zeal to the cause of higher

education, and the literature of the Southern Baptist Sunday-School Union and Publication Society has been built up chiefly under his untiring labors. In the South and South-west the 'Baptist' is an indisputable power in the advocacy of the most pronounced Baptist principles and practices. After the war its publishing-house was burned, and its assets, to the amount of \$100,000, destroyed, yet, without a dollar to begin with, Dr. Graves re-established his paper at Memphis. He has been its vigorous editor in an unbroken connection for forty years, and stands at his post, at nearly three-score-and-ten, the unfaltering advocate of the old landmarks of Baptist life, decided and distinct in all its denominational trends and interests.

'THE EXAMINER,' a New York Baptist weekly, has probably the largest circulation of any Baptist paper in the world, and has a most interesting history. The 'Baptist Advocate' was commenced in 1839, by the late William H. Wyckoff, LL.D., who remained its editor till 1845, when it changed ownership and name, being called the 'New York Recorder.' In 1850 Dr. M.B. Anderson became its owner and editor, and remained so till 1853. It was consolidated in 1855 with the 'Baptist Register,' a weekly then published at Utica, N.Y. As far back as 1808, Daniel Hascall, John Lawton and John Peck commenced the 'Western Baptist Magazine' in Central New York, as an organ of the Hamilton Missionary Society; this again was merged into the 'Baptist Register,' and, in 1855, Alexander M. Beebe, LL.D., a gentleman of genuine ability, high literary taste and the soundest of judgment, became its editor. Under his wisdom and management it soon attained a large circulation and influence, and he remained editor almost to the time of his death, in 1856. Only in the previous year the 'Register' had been combined with the 'Recorder,' with the further change of name to

the 'Examiner,' under the editorship of Edward Bright, D.D., who had for some years been the Corresponding Secretary of the Missionary Union, and for a longer period one of the publishers of the 'Baptist Register.' In 1850 the 'New York Chronicle' was commenced by Messrs. O.B. Judd and Hon. William B. Maclay. It soon attained a wide influence. In 1857 it passed into the hands of Pharcellus Church, D.D., who continued its editor till 1865, when it was united with the 'Examiner' under the name of the 'Examiner and Chronicle'; but recently the older title has been resumed, and it is now known simply as 'The Examiner.' Dr. Bright has edited it for more than a generation with very marked ability and success, and has made it one of the most influential religious organs in our country.

'THE BAPTIST WEEKLY,' published in New York, was formerly the organ of the Free Mission Society, which was organized in 1840. It was first known as the 'American Baptist,' and was edited by Rev. Warham Walker. The 'Christian Contributor' and the 'Western Christian' were merged into this paper, which was located at Utica until 1857, and after its removal to New York it was edited by the late Dr. Nathan Brown, missionary first to Assam and then to Japan. Dr. A.S. Patton became its owner and editor in 1872, and still manages all its interests. From that time until recently Dr. Middleditch acted as associate editor, but has now retired to found a new journal, a monthly, known as the 'Gospel Age.' The 'Weekly' has a large circulation, and is characterized for its kind spirit and firm maintenance of all that concerns the advancement of true Baptist interests in the world.

'THE MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN HERALD,' of Detroit, was established by the Baptist Convention of Michigan, in 1842. At first it was a monthly, then a semi-monthly, but in 1845 it became a weekly. Some years after, the

Convention sold it to Rev. Marvin Ahen, when it was edited by Rev. Miles Sanford and others till 1861. Then it fell under the editorial direction of Dr. Olney, who more than maintained its high literary character; but seeing that it was published at a financial loss, it was sold to the proprietors of the 'Christian Times and Witness,' of Illinois, in 1867. The Michigan Baptists, however, so felt the need of a State paper that the present proprietor of the 'Christian Herald,' Rev. L.H. Trowbridge, began its publication in 1870, in the interests of educational work, chiefly through Kalamazoo College. So healthy was its influence that the State Convention adopted it as its official organ, and it has become indispensable to the support of denominational enterprise in the State. It is conducted with great care and ability, and circulates largely amongst the 30,000 Baptists of Michigan.

'THE STANDARD,' of Chicago, Ill., dates from August 31, 1853. It was started as a new paper by a committee of the Fox River Baptist Association, of which Rev. J.C. Burroughs was chairman, under the name of 'The Christian Times,' and was the successor of the 'Watchman of the Prairies.' The following November, Rev. Leroy Church and Rev. Justin A. Smith assumed the control of the paper, and about three years later Edward Goodman, who had been connected with it from its inception, became one of the proprietors. In January, 1875, Dr. J.S. Dickerson purchased the interest of Rev. Leroy Church. When Dr. Dickerson died, in 1876, Mrs. Dickerson, with her son, J. Spencer Dickerson, continued His interest in the paper. The circulation of the 'Standard' is large and its character very high; the rank which it sustains being all the testimonial needed by its managers to their enterprise and the manly maintenance of their religious convictions.

'THE NATIONAL BAPTIST.' Toward the

close of 1864 our Churches in Philadelphia and its vicinity felt the need of a well-sustained paper to sustain denominational interests, especially in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The sum of \$17,000 was presented to the Baptist Publication Society for that purpose, and the first number was issued January 1st, 1865, under the editorial supervision of George W. Anderson, D.D. For three years Dr. Kendall Brooks acted as editor, but, becoming President of Kalamazoo College, Dr. Moss served as its editor until chosen professor in Crozer Theological Seminary. Dr. H.L. Wayland, the present editor, took charge of the paper in 1872, and in 1883 it became his property. Its editorial department has always been in able hands, and as a weekly paper it has become a power in the denomination, its present circulation being greatly in excess of that at any previous period in its history. Dr. Wayland leaves the marks of a clear and powerful mind upon its columns, and conducts it in that spirit of open fairness which challenges the admiration of his brethren, who uniformly rejoice in his editorial success.

The 'CHRISTIAN REVIEW,' a quarterly, was commenced in 1836, with Prof. Knowles as its first editor, but his sudden death in that year transferred his position to Dr. Barnas Sears, who brought it to the close of vol. vi. Dr. S.F. Smith then edited it to the close of vol. xiii, and Rev. E.G. Scars edited vol. xiv. Drs. Cutting, Turnbull, Murdock, Woolsey, Franklin Wilson, G.B. Taylor and E.G. Robinson, carried it to the end of vol. xxviii, in 1863, at which time its publication terminated. In 1867 the Baptist Publication Society began the issue of the 'Baptist Quarterly,' with Dr. L.E. Smith as editor-in-chief, and Drs. Hovey, Robinson, Arnold and Gregory as associates. At the end of vol. ii, Dr. Weston took the editorial chair, and eight volumes were issued, when its publication was discontinued. Dr. Barnes, of Cincinnati,

The American Baptists

begun the publication of the 'Baptist Review,' a quarterly, in 1878, but sold it in 1885, when its name was changed to the 'Baptist Quarterly,' and it is now under the editorial control of Dr. McArthur and Henry C. Vedder, Esq., New York. Many of the successive editors named performed their duties with remarkable ability, and won for the 'Review' a recognition in the religious literature of the land. The contributors, also, were amongst the best scholars and thinkers of America, but our Churches had not readied an appreciation of its learned discussions and withheld their support. The present editors of the 'Quarterly' have somewhat popularized the character of the articles, and it bids fair to maintain its existence. The number of educated and scholarly persons in our Churches is constantly increasing, and the best thought of the tiniest minds in them is likely to receive generous encouragement in such a desirable enterprise.

Besides the literary works which have been so abundantly mentioned in this work, in association with the many eminent Baptists treated of therein, it may be well to mention a few others which have done honor to their authors. Amongst an immense list we have Prof. Ripley on the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistle to the Hebrews; Dr. Malcom's 'Dictionary of Names, Objects and Terms found in the Holy Scriptures;' 'Christ in History;' by Dr. Turnbull; the 'Creative Week,' the 'Epiphanies of the Risen Lord,' and the 'Mountain Instruction,' by Dr. Boardman. On Baptism, we have the 'Act of Baptism,' by Dr. Burrage; 'The Mould of Doctrine;' by Dr. Jesse B. Thomas; 'Baptism in the Christian System,' by Dr. Tucker; and the great work of Dr. Conant, on Baptizein. On missions we have Dr. Gammell's 'History,' Dr. Edward Judson's life of his father, and the 'Story of Baptist Missions,' by Rev. O.W. Hervey. The Baptist press abounds in biographies of the great and

the good, and in general literature. Several volumes have come from the pen of Dr. Mathews; Abraham Mills has given us his great work on 'English Literature and Literary Men;' Mr. Hill and Mr. Bancroft have given us valuable works on rhetoric. Drs. Kendrick, J.L. Lincoln, Albert Harkness and J.E. Boise, have published editions of the Latin and Greek classics, which have been extensively used in schools and colleges. Dr. J.R. Loomis is the author of a series of Text books on Geology, Anatomy, and Physiology; and Dr. Edward Olney, of a complete series of mathematical text-books. In language, Dr. Hackett has translated Winer's 'Chaldee Grammar,' and Dr. Conant's edition of 'Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar' is the standard authority in the schools of America and Europe. This list might be doubled in length as an exhibition of literary activity of which we may be proud when we take into account that all these authors have been toilers either in the professor's chair or the pulpit, so that the ordinary duties of life were laborious if not exhausting; yet, out of their sound discipline, clear insight and good taste, they have been able to enrich almost every department of learning.

Besides this, an immense popular and cheap literature has been created on special denominational topics, in the shape of tracts, pamphlets and small books, by the American Baptist Publication Society. Twenty-five Baptists met in Washington, D. C., on the 20th of February, 1824, to consider the need of a tract society for the American Baptists. Rev. Noah Davis proposed that such a society should be formed, which idea was zealously favored by Messrs. Knowles, Staughton and Rice, and the body was organized at once. Its receipts for the first year were but \$373 80, with which it issued 696,000 pages of tracts. Two years later its headquarters were removed to Philadelphia, where it began to issue bound volumes. In 1840

it commenced to employ colporteurs to circulate its publications and to perform itinerant missionary work in destitute regions, and the name of the society was changed in 1845 to its present form. It undertook Sunday-school missionary work: in 1867, so that besides serving as a publishing house it preaches the Gospel from house to house by colporteurs, supplies families by gift or sale with Bibles and Baptist literature, and fosters the formation and aid of Sunday-schools. By a law of its own, a Sunday-school planted in a destitute region soon gives the nucleus of a Church, and a new literature adapted to youth, having this aim in view, has made its appearance. The 'Young Reaper,' commenced in 1856, reported a circulation for 1881-85 of 2,616,304 copies, and of the 'Bible Lesson Monthly,' in weekly parts, 5,448,000 copies. Within four years 900,000 copies of a popular Sunday-school song book were sold in the schools. A fair conception of the influence of the Society on the interest of Sunday-schools may be obtained, when it is stated, that in the current year for the Society's operations for 1884-85, 5,284,000 copies of Bible Lessons and 1,046,000 Advanced Quarterlies were sold, devoted to the exposition of the Bible Lesson for the Sabbath. These, besides an endless number of bound volumes, for library and gift-books in the schools, present some idea of this new literature created by the American Baptists within a score of years.

The many notable things which have been spoken of in the rapid growth of the Denomination might be supplemented by many others, but only two can be named: the endowment of our Churches with marvelous love for the salvation of men, and their zeal in promoting general revivals of religion; together with the new feeling of appreciation toward them by their brethren of other Christian denominations. In the South and Southwest

there were many in the early part of this century who were too creed-bound, in all that related to the divine purposes and decrees, to labor for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of multitudes of sinners. Indeed, in North Carolina, some of the early Baptists were actually infected with the superstition of Baptismal Regeneration. When they were first visited by Gano, Miller and Vanhorn, they confessed to those men that they had been immersed without faith, believing that this would save them; and some of their pastors confessed that they themselves were not converted, but were so anxious to baptize others that Burkitt and Read say, in the 'History of the Kehukee Association,' that they often baptized their candidates by fire-light in the night, lest they should change their minds before morning. This state of things gave rise to that Antinomianism which blighted many of the Southern Churches for a time, till the more intelligent and evangelical shook off this bondage, and began to use the truths and measures set forth by Whitefield with such blessed results that they reaped rich harvests for Christ, especially in Virginia, Georgia and Kentucky; the North soon caught the same spirit.

About 1830 a general awakening was seen in our Churches, and what were called 'two days' meetings' began to be held, to pray and labor for the conversion of sinners. These were so marked in their effects that the time was prolonged to four-days, and last of all to 'protracted meetings,' without regard to length of time. Then the system of modern evangelical labor was introduced, as some pastors left their pastorates to go from Church to Church, helping other pastors. Amongst the first of these was the Rev. Jacob Knapp, who resigned his pastoral duties at Watertown, N.Y., and devoted himself to that form of labor for more than forty years. His educational advantages had been

light, but his mind was strong and His doctrines sound, enforced by an uncommon knowledge of Scripture. His statements of truth were devoid of all attempt at rhetorical finish, but he was unusually fervent and fluent. His mind was marked by strong logical tendencies and his sermons were full of homely illustrations, apt passages from the Bible, and close knowledge of human nature. In person he was short, squarely and stoutly built, his voice was deeply sepulchral and his manner self-possessed; he was full of expedient and his will was indomitable. Crowds followed him, whole communities were moved by his labors and great numbers were added to the Churches. Dr. Reuben Jeffery edited his sermons and Autobiography, which were published in 1868, and gave a lively picture of his style and labors. Mr. Knapp says that he kept an account of the number converted under his ministry for the first twenty years' work as an evangelist, but gave up the attempt after the count readied 100,000. Of course, he met with much opposition, and often he was charged with a love of money; but he says that, aside from His traveling expenses, he received from the Churches only about 500 per annum. The writer heard him preach many times, and judged him, as he is apt to judge men, more by his prayers than his sermons, for he was a man of much prayer. His appearance in the pulpit was very striking, His face pale, his skin dark, his mouth wide, with a singular cast in one eye bordering on a squint; he was full of native wit, almost gestureless, and vehement in denunciation, yet so cool in his deliberation that with the greatest ease he gave every trying circumstance its appropriate but unexpected turn.

Other evangelists soon entered the field, many of them meeting with good success. Amongst these may be mentioned T.J. Fisher, of Kentucky, with Messrs. Raymond, Swan, Earle, DeWitt and Gravlis. Many of our pastors

have been noted for the culture of revival influences in their Churches. Borne of them through a long course of years; as in the case of the late Lyman Wright, and of the two honored men who have held the same pastorates with great power for more than forty years: Dr. George C. Baldwin, of Troy, N.Y., and Dr. Daniel J. Corey, of Utica, N.Y. These are mentioned simply as examples of many others in our ministry. And it has been specially delightful in latter years to find numbers of the Presidents and Professors in our colleges and universities laboring with great energy for the salvation as well as for the education of their students, some of them reaping a large harvest. So that, taking the denomination as a whole, during the present century there has been an increase of zeal wisely used in this direction. The natural tendency of things in the olden times of harsh and hard controversy on infant baptism, when our fathers were obliged to struggle all the time for the right to be, was, to look with comparative indifference, if not suspicion, on the conversion of youth in very tender age. Happily, that unreasonable and unlovely state of things is passing away, and our Churches are learning the holy art of winning very young children to Jesus, as soon as they can understand his claims upon them and are able to love and serve him. Inasmuch as we reject the fraud of practicing upon them a rite which leaves them no choice in casting their own religious life, we are under double obligation to teach, and draw, and watch, and influence them to the service of our precious Master. We have come to look upon the neglect of these duties as sheer and downright wickedness, and instead of leaving our children to run wild until their hearts are all gnarled and scarified, like a knotted oak-tree, we are bringing our little ones to Jesus, that he may lay his hands on them and bless them.

The better understanding which has arisen

between Baptists and other Christians is a matter for gratitude, and especially because our Churches have in no wise compromised their honor or consistency to secure this result. The candor and grasp of German scholarship and the independence of English High Churchmen has had much to do with this change. In the German and English controversies on baptism, especially in the Tractarian movement of the latter, the concession has been made without reluctance that the classical and ecclesiastical literature of the New Testament period and the early Christian centuries sustain the Baptist position. Then, in purification of the change which early took place in the ordinances, instead of forcing all sorts of unnatural interpretations upon the facts and teachings of the Bible, the open avowal is very commonly made, that the Church had the right to change Christ's ordinances as convenience required. A noted example in point is that of the late Dean of Westminster, who, when visiting America in 1878, replied to an address of welcome from the Baptist ministers of New York and Brooklyn on November 4th; thus:

'You have alluded to me in your address as an ecclesiastical historian, and have referred to the undoubted antiquity of your principal ceremony – that of immersion. I feel that here, also, we ought to be grateful to you for having, almost alone in the Western Church, preserved intact this singular and interesting relic of primitive and Apostolic times, which we, you will forgive me for saying so – *which we, at least in our practice, have wisely discarded*. For wise reasons the Primitive Baptism was set aside. The spirit which lives and moves in human society can override even the most sacred ordinances.'

Here, a manly honesty meets an issue of stubborn facts not with a flat and false denial of its existence, but with the real reason for setting aside a Divine institution. The frankness of this statement is characteristic of the man; he boldly

tells us that these who have ceased to immerse have 'discarded' the practice of 'Apostolic times,' and thinks that they have done so 'wisely,' without any authority from the Lord of the Apostles for rejecting one of his 'singular and interesting' institutions. The Dean had an affection for modern methods of religious substitution in things which he regarded as of secondary consequence, and he could not see how a man's conscience and convictions of duty should bind him to what the Dean could not understand as important. Hence, while he acknowledged that he 'ought to be grateful' to the Baptists, for having cleaved to the Apostolic practice 'almost alone' in Western Christendom, it was hard for him to see exactly why they should not 'discard' it as well as others did. Great as was his tolerance in thought, when he looked at any religious point even through his affections he betrayed a tinge of intolerance. His most courteous allowance in such cases was mingled with a touch of scorn for what he could not fully comprehend; therefore, brave as he held the Baptists to be for unswerving fidelity to the Bible form of baptism, he saw no need for this constancy, but candidly said, 'We have altered all that long ago,' without the slightest attempt at popular equivocation.

Possibly no Baptist writer of our times awakened less asperity in Pedobaptist minds than the late Dr. William E. Williams, yet on this very point no man more completely covers the right interpretation of true Baptist conviction. He says:

'We read in the ordinance as the Sovereign bequeathed it, in the yielding waters that bury and then restore the loyal disciple, the cenotaph of our great Leader, the persistent tomb perpetually erected by which he would have his death set forth to the end of the world, and his exulting triumph over death, and His jubilant entrance into Paradise as well. And if it would be thought temerity

The American Baptists

for a follower of Michael Angelo or of Christopher Wren to pull down the tomb of either of these great architects on the plea of substituting a better, is it less temerity to innovate on the design in the gate of His own Church, reared by The Great Architect? Bury us into the tomb he occupied. Plant us into the new emerging life that he there displayed, nor think it shame to stand loyally by the ways that he has opened, and that none in all the world may better.'

He deprecates all change from Christ's appointment either in the subject or act of baptism as:

'A most dangerous assumption of power in the Church, and also a most rash ascription of intrinsic and magical efficacy to the outer emblem. The Churches early, but most unrighteously, learned to annex not only the remission of sins to the ordinance, but the regeneration itself – to attach pardon from Christ and new life from the Holy Ghost as sequents to an external rite. Priestly hands and Church laver's were thus employed, by an assumption that not one page of Scripture warrants, to usurp the prerogatives of God the adopting Father and Christ the mediating Brother, and the Paraclete, the renewing and

illuminating Teacher.' Lees. *Bap. Hist.* pp. 82,83.

In like manner, as men return to the simplicity of the Lord's Supper, in the spirit of the New Testament, for the purely memorial purpose of setting forth Christ's death, they come better to understand why Baptists reject the Romish interpretation that it is a test of love between Christian men, or a bond of spiritual fellowship in any Bible sense whatever. The more other Christians come to respect them for their protest against its abuse, and to recognize them as extending brotherly love, and with it acts of Christian brotherhood in the substantial deeds of benevolence, in the mutual burden-bearing of everyday life, and in that unity of the Holy Spirit by which birth from above is attested, rather than in the act of breaking bread, where the pure disciple and the hypocrite, the precious and the vile, have in all ages eaten the Supper together, and still sit at the same table in all Christian Denominations; the more they challenge universal respect, as the interpreters of the one Gospel baptism.

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

Early in the Nineteenth Century, local Bible Societies sprang up in various American towns and cities. So far as is known, the first of these was formed in Philadelphia, in December, 1808, primarily under the wisdom and zeal of Dr. Staughton, who was its first recording secretary and wrote its appeals for aid. In February, 1809, a similar society was organized in New York, called the 'Young Men's Bible Society,' and on this wise. William Colgate, a young Englishman, sacredly cherished a Bible which had been presented to him by his father, which was kept in his pew in the First Baptist meeting-house; but it was stolen, and thinking that Bibles must be very scarce or they would not be taken by theft, he conversed with others, and they resolved to form a society to meet the want. This society comprehended the purpose of translation as well as of circulation, and incorporated the following into its Constitution as its defining article:

'The object of this Society is to distribute the Bible only – and that without notes – amongst such persons as may not be able to purchase it; and also, as far as may be practicable, to translate or assist in causing it to be translated into other languages.'

Soon other societies were formed in different places, and the universal want of a General Society began to be felt. At length, May 11, 1816, thirty-five local societies in different parts of the country sent delegates to a Bible Convention which assembled in New York, and organized the American Bible Society for 'The dissemination of the Scriptures in the received versions where they exist, and in the most faithful where they may be required.' Most of the local societies either disbanded or were made auxilliary to the General Society. The Baptists became at once its earnest and liberal supporters. As early as 1830 it made an appropriation of \$1,200 for Judson's 'Burman

Bible,' through the Baptist Triennial Convention, with the full knowledge that he had translated the family of words relating to baptism by words which meant immerse and immersion, and down to 1835 the Society had appropriated \$18,500 for the same purpose. The Triennial Convention had instructed its missionaries in April, 1833, thus:

'Resolved, That the Board feel it to be their duty to adopt all prudent measures to give to the heathen the pure word of God in their own languages, and to furnish their missionaries with all the means in their power to make their translation as exact a representation of the mind of the Holy Spirit as may be possible.

Resolved, That all the missionaries of the Board who are, or who shall be, engaged in translating the Scriptures, be instructed to endeavor, by earnest prayer and diligent study, to ascertain the precise meaning of the original text, to express that meaning as exactly as the nature of the languages into which they shall translate the Bible will permit, and to transfer no words which are capable of being literally translated.'

In 1835 Mr. Pearce asked the Society to aid in printing the 'Bengali New Testament,' which was translated upon the same principle as Judson's Bible. The committee which considered the application reported as follows: 'That the committee do not deem it expedient to recommend an appropriation, until the Board settle a principle in relation to the Greek word *baptiso*.' Then the whole subject was referred to a committee of seven, who, November 19, 1835, presented the following reports:

'The Committee to whom was recommitted the determining of a principle upon which the American Bible Society will aid in printing and distributing the Bible in foreign languages, beg leave to report,

'That they are of the opinion that it is expedient to withdraw their former report on

The American Baptists

the particular case, and to present the following one *on the general principle*:

'By the Constitution of the American Bible Society, its Managers are, in the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, restricted to such copies as are without note or comment, and in the English language, to the version in common use. The design of these restrictions clearly seems to have been to simplify and mark out the duties of the Society; so that all the religious denominations of which it is composed might harmoniously unite in performing those duties.

'As the Managers are now called to aid extensively in circulating the Sacred Scriptures in languages other than the English, they deem it their duty, in conformity with the obvious spirit of their compact, to adopt the following resolution as the rule of their conduct in making appropriations for the circulation of the Scriptures in all foreign tongues:

'*Resolved* 1. That in appropriating money for the translating, printing or distributing of the Sacred Scriptures in Foreign languages, the Managers feel at liberty to encourage only such versions as conform in the principle of their translation to the common English version, at least so far as that all the religious denominations represented in this Society, can consistently use and circulate said versions in their several schools and communities.

'*Resolved*, 2. That a copy of the above preamble and resolution be sent to each of the Missionary Boards accustomed to receive pecuniary grants from the Society, with a request that the same may be transmitted to their respective mission stations, where the Scriptures are in process of translation, and also that the several Mission Boards be informed that their application for aid must be accompanied with a declaration that the versions which they propose to circulate are executed in accordance with the above resolution.

'THOMAS MACAULEY; Chairman, WM. H. VANVLECK, JAMES MILNOR, FRANCES HALL, THOMAS DEWITT, THOMAS COCK.'

COUNTER REPORT.

'The subscriber, as a member of the Committee to whom was referred the

application of Messrs. Pearce and Yates, for aid in the circulation of the Bengali New Testament, begs leave to submit the following considerations:

'1. The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions have not been under the impression that the American Bible Society was organized upon the central principle that *baptizo* and its cognates were never to be translated, but always transferred, in all versions of the Scriptures patronized by them. Had this principle been candidly stated and uniformly acted upon by the Society in the appropriation of its funds for foreign distribution, the Baptists never could have been guilty of the folly or duplicity of soliciting aid for translations made by their missionaries.

'2. As there is now a large balance in the treasury of the American Bible Society, as many liberal bequests and donations have been made by Baptists, and as these were made in the full confidence that the Society could constitutionally assist their own denomination, as well as the other evangelical denominations comprising the Institution, in giving the Bible to the heathen world, therefore,

'*Resolved*, That \$ — be appropriated and paid to the Baptist General Convention of the United States for Foreign Missions, to aid them in the work of supplying the perishing millions of the East with the Sacred Scriptures.

SPENCER H. CONE.'

It must stand to the everlasting honor of the Triennial Convention that they regarded the Author of the Bible as the only being to be consulted in this matter. They disallowed any voice to the translator in making his translation, but virtually said to him: 'The parchment which you hold in your hand is God's word, all that you have to do is to re-utter the Divine voice. The right of Jehovah to a hearing as he will is the only consideration in this case. You are to inquire of him by earnest prayer, you are to use the most diligent study to ascertain the precise meaning of the original text, then you are to make your translation as exact a representation of the mind of the Holy Spirit as may be

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

possible, so far as the nature of the language into which you translate will permit.' In contrast with this, the Bible Society said: 'You are to take the common English version and conform your version to the principle on which it was made, so that all "denominations represented in this Society can use it in their schools and communities.'" A version, and that quite imperfect, was to be made the standard by which all versions should be made, and the voice of all the denominations in the Society was to be consulted instead of the mind of the Holy Spirit. Such an untenable position settled the question of further co-operation with the Society in the making and circulation of foreign versions, for a more dangerous position could not be taken. Up to that time, including a large legacy which John F. Marsh had made, the Baptists had contributed to the treasury of the Bible Society at least \$170,000, and had received for their missionary versions less than \$30,000. On May 12, 1836, the Bible Society approved the attitude of its Board, and \$5,000 was voted for the versions made by the Baptist missionaries to be used on the new principle which had been adopted. The Baptist members of the Board presented a clear, calm and dignified Protest, but were not allowed even to read it to the Board. Amongst many other grave considerations they submitted these: 'The Baptists cannot, consistently with their religious principles, in any case where they are permitted to choose, consent to use or circulate any version in which any important portion of divine truth is concealed or obscured, either by non-translation or by ambiguity of expression...This resolution exposes the Society, almost unavoidably, to the charge or suspicion of sectarian motives. For, without pretending, in the least, to impeach the accuracy of the versions against which it is directed, the principal reason offered by its advocates when urging its adoption was, "That

Pedobaptists might have an opportunity of prosecuting their missionary operations without let or hinderance, where the translations of the Baptists are in circulation." And surely, a version that purposely withholds the truth, either by non-translation or by ambiguity of expression, for the sake of accommodating Pedobaptists, is as really sectarian as one that adds to the truth from the same motive...The imperfection and injustice of the resolution are strikingly manifested in the continued circulation of Roman Catholic versions, which are neither conformed in the principle of their translation to the common English version, nor can they be consistently used by the different denominations represented in the American Bible Society. They are characterized by the numerous absurd and heretical dogmas of the Catholic sect, and yet the rule in question cordially approves of their extensive distribution, while the translations of pious, faithful and learned Baptist ministers are rejected.'

The Board of the Triennial Convention met at Hartford, Conn., on the 7th of April, 1836, and at once 'respectfully informed' the Board of the American Bible Society that they could not 'consistently and conscientiously comply with the conditions' on which their appropriation was made, and that they could not, 'therefore, accept the sum appropriated.' Here, then, the sharp issue was drawn between the question of denominational 'use' and 'the mind of the Holy Spirit,' in the holy work of Bible translation. Not only was the Baptist position sustained, but the manly and Christian stand taken by its representatives in the Board was approved by our Churches, and an almost unanimous determination was readied to support the faithful versions made by our missionaries. Action was taken in Churches, associations and conventions, and an almost universal demand was made for a new Bible Society. Powerful

The American Baptists

pens were also wielded outside the Baptist body to defend their course, amongst them that of the late Joshua Leavitt, a distinguished Congregationalist, who said:

"The Baptist Board had instructed their missionaries on the subject, "to make their translations as exact a representation of the mind of the Holy Spirit as may be possible;" and "to transfer no words which are capable of being literally translated." This instruction was a transcript of the principle which underlies the Baptist Churches, to wit, in settled and conscientious belief that the word *baptizo* means "immerse" and nothing else. It was plainly impossible that Baptist missionaries should honestly translate in any other way. Then the debate turned, in effect, upon the question whether the Bible Society should recognize such men as Judson and his associates as trustworthy translators of the word of God for a people who had been taught the Gospel by them, and for whose use there was, and could be, no other version...The effect of the resolution was to make the Bible Society, in its actual administration, a Pedobaptist or sectarian institution. It was a virtual exclusion of the Baptists from their past rights as the equal associates of their brethren by the solemn compact of the constitution. It left them no alternative but to withdraw, and take measures of their own to supply the millions of Burma with the Scriptures in the only version which could be had, and the only one which they would receive. It was a public exemplification of bad faith in adherence to the constitution of a religious benevolent society. That it attracted so little public attention at the time must be attributed to the general absorption of the public mind with other pursuits and questions and, more than all, to the fact that it was a minority which suffered injustice, while a large majority were more gratified than otherwise at their discomfiture. But the greatest injury was done to the cause of Christian union and to the unity of the Protestant hosts in the conflict with Rome. And this evil is now just about to develop itself in its full extent. The Bible Society, in its original construction, and by its natural and

proper influence, ought to be able to present itself before all the world as the representative and exponent of the Protestantism of this nation, instead of which it is only the instrument of sectarian exclusiveness and injustice. One of the largest, most zealous and evangelical and highly progressive Protestant bodies is cut off and set aside, and the Society stands before the world as a one-sided thing, and capable of persistent injustice in favor of a denominational dogma.

'This publication is made under the influence of a strong belief of the imperative necessity which now presses upon us to RIGHT THIS WRONG, that we may be prepared for the grand enterprise, the earnest efforts, the glorious results for the kingdom of Christ, which are just opening before us. We must close up our ranks, we-must reunite all hearts and all hands, in the only way possible, by falling back upon the original constitution of the Society, in letter and spirit, BY THE SIMPLE REPEAL OF THE RESOLUTION.'

Many Baptists from various parts of the country attended the annual meeting of the Bible Society in New York, on the 12th of May, 1836, and when it deliberately adopted the policy of the board as its own permanent plan, about 120 of these held a meeting for deliberation on the 13th, in the Oliver Street Baptist meeting-house, with Dr. Nathaniel Kendrick in the chair. The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, which met at Hartford, April 27th, had anticipated the possible result, and resolved that in this event it would 'be the duty of the Baptist denomination in the United States to form a distinct organization for Bible translation and distribution in foreign tongues,' and had resolved on the need of a Convention of Churches, at Philadelphia, in April, 1837, 'to adopt such measures as circumstances, in the providence of God may require.' But the meeting in Oliver Street thought it wise to form a new Bible Society at once, and on that day organized the American and Foreign Bible Society provisionally, subject to the decision of

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

the Convention to be held in Philadelphia. This society was formed 'to promote a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, in the most faithful versions that can be procured.' In three months it sent \$13,000 for the circulation of Asiatic Scriptures, and moved forward with great enthusiasm.

After a year's deliberation the great Bible Convention met in the meetinghouse of the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, April 26th, 1837. It consisted of 390 members, sent from Churches, Associations, State Conventions, Education Societies and other bodies, in twenty-three States and in the District of Columbia. Rev. Charles Gr. Sommers, Lucius Bolles and Jonathan Going, the committee on 'credentials,' reported that 'in nearly all the letters and minutes where particular instructions are given to the delegates, your committee find a very decided sentiment in favor of a distinct and unfettered organization for Bible translation and distribution.' The official record says that the business of the Convention was 'to consider and decide upon the duty of the denomination, in existing circumstances, respecting the translation and distribution of the sacred Scriptures. Eufas Babcock, of Pennsylvania, was chosen president of the body; with Abiel Sherwood, of Georgia, and Baron Stow, of Massachusetts, as secretaries. Amongst its members there were present: From Maine, John S. Maginnis; New Hampshire, E.E. Cummings; Vermont, Elijah Hutchinson; Massachusetts, George B. Ide, Heman Lincoln, Daniel Sharp, Wm. Hague and James D. Knowles; and from Rhode Island, Francis Wayland, David Benedict and John Blain. Connecticut sent James L. Hodge, Rollin H. Neale, Irah Chase and Lucius Bolles. From New York we have diaries G. Sommers, Wm. Colgate, Edward Kingsford, Alexander M. Beebee, Daniel Haskall, Nathaniel Kendrick, John Peck, Wm. H. Williams, Wm. Parkinson,

Duncan Dunbar, Spencer H. Cone, John Dowling and B.T. Welch. New Jersey was represented by Samuel Aaron, Thomas Swaim, Daniel Dodge, Peter P. Bunyon, Simon J. Drake, M.J. Rhees and Charles J. Hopkins. Pennsylvania sent Horatio G. Jones, Joseph Taylor, Win. T. Brantly, J.H. Kennard, J.M. Linnard, Wm. Shadrach, A.D. Gillette and Rufus Babcock. Then from Maryland we find Wm. Crane and Stephen P. Hill; and from Virginia, Thomas Hume, J.B. Taylor, J.B. Jeter and Thomas D. Toy. These were there, with others of equal weight of character and name.

When such momentous issues were pending, our fathers found themselves differing widely in opinion. Some thought a new Bible Society indispensable; others deprecated such a step; some wished to confine the work of the new society to foreign versions; others thought not only that its work should be unrestricted as to field, but that consistency and fidelity to God required it to apply to the English and all other versions the principle which was to be applied to versions in heathen lands, thus making it faithful to God's truth for all lands. The discussion ran through three days, and was participated in by the ablest minds of the denomination, being specially keen, searching and thorough. Professor Knowles says:

'Much feeling was occasionally exhibited, and some undesirable remarks were made. But, with little exception, an excellent spirit reigned throughout the meeting. It was, we believe, the largest and most intelligent assembly of Baptist ministers and laymen that has ever been held. There was a display of talent, eloquence and piety which, we venture to say, no other ecclesiastical body in our country could surpass. Our own estimate of the ability and sound principles of our brethren was greatly elevated. We saw, too, increased evidence that our Churches were firmly united. While there was an independence of opinion which was worthy of

The American Baptists

Christians and freemen, there was a kind spirit of conciliation. Each man who spoke declared his views with entire frankness; but when the question was taken, the vast body of delegates voted almost in solid column. They all, we believe, with a few exceptions, are satisfied with the results of the meeting as far as regards the present position of the society. The question respecting the range of its operations remains to be decided. We hope that it will be discussed in a calm and fraternal spirit. Let each man be willing to hear his brother's opinion, and to yield his own wishes to those of the majority. We see no reason why any one should be pertinacious. If it should be determined to give to the society an unrestricted range, no man will be obliged to sustain it unless he choose. He who may still prefer to send his money to the American Bible Society can do so. Let us maintain peace among ourselves. Our own union is of more importance than any particular measures which we could adopt, no benefits which would ensue from the operations of any society would compensate for the loss of harmony in our Churches.' So far the words of Prof. Knowles.

The final decisions of this great Convention are found in the following resolutions, which it adopted 'almost in solid column;' namely:

'1. *Resolved*, That under existing circumstances it is the indispensable duty of the Baptist denomination in the United States to organize a distinct society for the purpose of aiding in the translation, printing and circulation of the sacred Scriptures.

'2. *Resolved*, That this organization be known by the name of the American and Foreign Bible Society.

'3. *Resolved*, That the society confine its efforts during the ensuing year to the circulation of the Word of God in foreign tongues.

'4. *Resolved*, That the Baptist denomination in the United States be affectionately requested to send to the Society, at its annual meeting during the last week 'in April, 1838, their views as to the duty of the Society to engage in the work of home distribution.

'5. *Resolved*. That a committee of one

from each State and district represented in this convention be appointed to draft a constitution and nominate a board of officers for the ensuing year.'

A constitution was then adopted and officers chosen by the Convention itself. It elected Spencer H. Cone for President. Charles G. Sommers for Corresponding Secretary, William Colgate for Treasurer and John West for Recording Secretary; together with thirty-six managers, who, according to the eighth article of the constitution, were 'brethren in good standing in Baptist Churches.'

The convention also instructed its officers to issue a circular to the Baptist Churches throughout the United States, commending its work to their co-operation and confidence, and especially soliciting them to send to the new Society an expression of their wishes as to its duty in the matter of home circulation. This request was very generally complied with, and so earnest was the wish to make it a 'society for the world,' that at its annual meeting in 1838 its constitution was so amended as to read: 'It shall be the object of this Society to aid in the wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures in all lands.' Thus the Baptists took the high and holy ground that they were called to conserve fidelity to God in translating the Bible, and that if they failed to do this on principle, they would fail to honor him altogether in this matter; because the Society which they had founded was the only Bible organization then established which had no fellowship with compromises in Bible translation.

From the first, many in the new Society, led by Dr. Gone, desired to proceed at once to a revision of the English Scriptures, under the guidance of the principles applied to the Asiatic versions made by the Baptist missionaries. But in deference to the opposition of some who approved of the Society in all other respects, at its annual meeting in 1838 it 'Resolved, That in

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

the distribution of the Scriptures in the English language, they will use the commonly received version until otherwise directed by the Society.' Whatever difference of opinion existed amongst the founders of that Society about the immediate expediency of applying the principle of its constitution to the English version, its ultimate application became but a question of time, and this action was postponed for fourteen years. Meanwhile, this measure was pressed in various directions, in addresses at its anniversaries, in essays published by various persons, and in the Society's correspondence. In 1842 Rev. Messrs. David Bernard and Samuel Aaron issued a very able treatise on the need of 'Revising and Amending King James' Version of the Holy Scriptures.' They also procured and published in that year, through the publishing house of J.B. Lippincott, of Philadelphia, a revised version of the Old and New Testaments, 'carefully revised and amended by several Biblical scholars.' This they say they did 'in accordance with the advice of many distinguished brethren, the services of a number of professors, some of whom rank among the first in our country for their knowledge of the original languages and Biblical interpretation and criticism, have been secured to prepare this work.' Amongst these were the late Prof. Whiting, Prof. A.C. Kendrick and other leading scholars who still live and have labored on other revisions.

The American and Foreign Bible Society held its annual meeting in New York May 11th, 1849, and, on the motion of Hon. Isaac Davis, of Massachusetts, after considerable discussion, it was 'Resolved, That the restriction laid by the Society upon the Board of Managers in 1838, to use only the commonly received version in the distribution of the Scriptures in the English language, be removed.' This restriction being removed, the new board referred the question of revision to a committee of five. After long

consideration that committee presented three reports: one with three signatures and two minority reports. The third, from the pen of Warren Carter, Esq., was long and labored as an argument against altering the common version at all. In January, 1850, the majority report was unanimously adopted in these words:

'Resolved, That, in the opinion of this board, the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ought to be faithfully and accurately translated into every living language.'

'Resolved, That wherever, in versions now in use, known and obvious errors exist, and wherever the meaning of the original is concealed or obscured, suitable measures ought to be prosecuted to correct those versions, so as to render the truth clear and intelligible to the ordinary reader.'

'Resolved, That, in regard to the expediency of this board undertaking the correction of the English version, a decided difference of opinion exists, and, therefore, that it be judged most prudent to await the instructions of the Society.'

On the publication of these resolutions the greatest excitement spread through the denomination. Most of its journals were flooded with communications, pro and con, sermons were preached in a number of pulpits denouncing the movement, and public meetings were held in several cities to the same end, notable amongst them one at the Oliver Street Church, in New York, April 4th, 1850. This feeling was greatly increased by the two following facts: Mr. Carter, an intelligent layman, but neither a scholar nor an able thinker, having submitted a learned and elaborate paper as his minority report, which occupied an hour in the reading, and believing that it was inspired by an astute author in New York who had opposed the Society from the first, and was then a member of the Board of the American Bible Society, Dr. Cone and William H. Wyckoff, President and Secretary

The American Baptists

of the American and Foreign Bible Society, published a pamphlet over their names in defense of the action of the board, under the title, 'The Bible Translated.' The second fact arose from the demand of Mr. Carter that those in favor of a revision of the English Scriptures should issue, in the form of a small edition of the New Testament, a specimen of the character of the emendations which they desired, in regard to obsolete words, to words and phrases that failed to express the meaning of the original Greek, or the addition of words by the translators, errors in grammar, profane expressions and sectarian renderings. Deacon William Colgate, the Treasurer, said that he approved of this suggestion, and that if Brethren Cone and Wyckoff would procure and issue such an edition as a personal enterprise, he, as a friend of revision, would personally pay the cost of the plates and printing. This was done, and in their preface they stated that by the aid of 'eminent scholars,' who had 'kindly co-operated and given their hearty approval to the proposed corrections,' they submitted their work, not for acceptance by the Society, but as a specimen of some changes which might be properly made, and that the plates would be presented to the Society if they were desired. This was sufficient to fan the fire to a huge flame; much stormy and uncalled for severity was invoked, and a large attendance was called for at the annual meeting to 'rebuke this metropolitan power' and crush the movement forever.

Men of the highest ability took sides and published their views, some demanding revision at once, others admitting its necessity but hesitating as to what might be the proper method to procure it, and still others full of fiery denunciation of Cone, Wyckoff and Colgate, and their sympathizers; as if they were guilty of the basest crime for desiring as good a version for the English speaking people as the

Baptists were giving to the East Indians. Many others also talked as much at random as if they feared that the book which they hinted had come down from heaven in about its present shape, printed and bound, was now to be taken from them by force. From the abundant material before the writer a large volume might be submitted of the sayings and doings of many persons, of whom some are still living, and some have gone to their account with God; but as no good end can be secured at present by their reproduction they are passed in silence. It is much more grateful to refer to those more calm and thoughtful minds who stood unmoved in the storm, and, although they did not at that time see their way clear to aid the work of revision, yet spoke in a manner worthy of themselves as men of God in handling a great and grave subject, worthy of the Master whom they served, showing their consistency as defenders of our missionary versions. Pre-eminent amongst these was the late Dr. Hackett, who thus expressed himself May 2d, 1850:

'It is admitted that the received English version of the Scriptures is susceptible of improvement. During the more than 200 years which have passed since it was made, our means for the explanation, both of the text and the subjects of the Bible, have been greatly increased. The original languages in which it was written have continued to occupy the attention of scholars, and are now more perfectly understood. Much light has been thrown upon the meaning of words. Many of them are seen to have been incorrectly defined, and many more to have been rendered with less precision than is now attainable. The various collateral branches of knowledge have been advanced to a more perfect state. History, geography, antiquities, the monuments and customs of the countries where the sacred writers lived, and where the scenes which they describe took place, have been investigated with untiring zeal, and have

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

yielded, at length, results which afford advantages to the translator of the Scriptures at the present day, which no preceding age has enjoyed. It is eminently desirable that we then have in our language a translation of the Bible conformed to the present state of critical learning.'

The Society met for its thirteenth anniversary in New York on the morning of May 22d, 1850. The crowd of life members, life directors and other delegates was very large, and the excitement rose as high as it well could. From the first it was manifest that calm, deliberate discussion and conference were not to be had, but that measures adverse to all revision were to be carried with a high hand. It had been customary to elect officers and managers before the public services; but, before this could be done Rev. Isaac Westcott moved: 'That this Society, in the issues of circulation of the English Scriptures, be restricted to the commonly received version, without note or comment;' and further moved that, as probably all minds were made up on the question, the vote than be taken without debate. Determined resistance to this summary process secured the postponement of the question to the afternoon, and other business was attended to. At that session each speaker was confined to fifteen minutes. Then in the heat of the Society it so far forgot the object of its organization as to vote down by an overwhelming majority the very principle on which it was organized. In the hope that, if revision could not be entertained, at least a great principle might be conserved as a general basis of agreement thereafter, the revisionists, on consultation, submitted the following: 'Resolved, That it is the duty of the Society to circulate the sacred Scriptures in the most faithful versions that can be procured.' When the Society had rejected this, and thus stultified itself, and denied not only its paternity but its right to exist by rejecting that

fundamental principle, it was seen at a glance that all hope of its unity was gone. Yet, as a last hope that it might be saved, the following conciliatory resolution was submitted, but was not even entertained, namely:

'Whereas, Numerous criticisms of the learned of all denominations of Christians demonstrate the susceptibility of many improvements in the commonly received version of the English Scriptures; and whereas, it is deemed inexpedient for one denomination of Christians alone to attempt these improvements, provided the cooperation of others can be secured; therefore

'Resolved, That a committee of – pious, faithful, and learned men, in the United States of America or elsewhere, be appointed for the purpose of opening a correspondence with the Christian and learned world, on all points necessarily involved in the question of revising the English Scriptures; that said committee be requested to present to the Society at the next annual meeting a report of their investigations and correspondence, with a statement of their views as to what revision of the English Scriptures it would be proper to make, if any; that until such report and statement shall have been acted upon by the Society the Board of Managers shall be restricted in their English issues to the commonly received version; and that all necessary expenses attendant upon this correspondence and investigation be paid by the Society.'

On the 23d, the following, offered by Rev. Dr. Turnbull, of Connecticut, was adopted:

'Resolved, That it is not the province and duty of the American and Foreign Bible Society to attempt, on their own part, or procure from others, a revision of the commonly received English version of the Scriptures.'

This action was followed by the election of the officers and the board by ballot, when Dr. Cone was re-elected President; but the Secretary, William H. Wyckoff, and the venerable Deacon Colgate, were proscribed,

together with ten of the old managers, all known revisionists, no person then present can wish to witness another such scene in a Baptist body to the close of life. Dr. Cone, at that time in his sixty-sixth year, rose like a patriarch, his hair as white as snow. As soon as the seething multitude in the Mulberry Street Tabernacle could be stilled, he said, with a stifled and almost clicked utterance: 'Brethren, I believe my work in this Society is done. Allow me to tender you my resignation. I did not withdraw my name in advance, because of the seeming egotism of such a step. I thank you, my brethren, for the kindly manner in which you have been pleased to tender me once more the office of President of your Society. But I cannot serve you longer. I am crushed.' The Society at first refused to receive his resignation, but, remaining firm in his purpose, it was accepted. When Messrs. Cone, Colgate and Wyckoff rose to leave the house in company, Dr. Cone invited Dr. Sommers, the first Vice-President, to the 'chair, remarking that God had a work for him to do which he was not permitted to do in that Society; and bowing, like a prince in Israel uncrowned for his fidelity, he said, amid the sobbing of the audience: I bid you, my brethren, an affectionate farewell as President of a Society that I have loved, which has cost me money, with much labor, prayer and tears. I hope that God will direct your future course in mercy; that we may do as much good as such creatures as we are able to accomplish. May the Lord Jesus bless you all.' Dr. Bartholomew T. Welch was chosen President, and Dr. Cutting Secretary of the American and Foreign Bible Society; then the body adjourned.

Spencer H. Cone, D.D., was, by nature, a man of mark, and would have been a leader in any sphere of life. He was born at Princeton, N J., April 13, 1785. His father and mother were members of the Hopewell Baptist Church. His father was high-spirited and fearless, noted for

his gentlemanly and finished manners. He was an unflinching Whig, and fought with great bravery in the Revolution. Mrs. Cone was the daughter of Col. Joab Houghton. She possessed a vigorous intellect, great personal beauty, and an indomitable moral courage. Late in life, Dr. Cone loved to speak of the earnest and enlightened piety of his parents. When about fifty years of age he said in a sermon: 'My mother was baptized when I was a few months old, and soon after her baptism, as I was sleeping on her lap, she was much drawn out in prayer for her babe and supposed she received an answer, with the assurance that the child should live to preach the Gospel of Christ. The assurance never left her; and it induced her to make the most persevering efforts to send me to Princeton – a course, at first, much against my father's will. This she told me after my conversion; it had been a comfort to her in the darkest hour of domestic trial; for she had never doubted that her hope would be sooner or later fulfilled.' At the age of twelve he entered Princeton College as a Freshman, but at fourteen he was obliged to leave, when in his Sophomore year, in consequence of the mental derangement of his father and the reduction of the family to a penniless condition; they went through a hard struggle for many years. Yet the lad of fourteen took upon him the support of his father and mother, four sisters and a younger brother, and never lost heart or hope. He spent seven years as a teacher, first in the Bordentown Academy, having charge of the Latin and Greek department, and then he became assistant in the Philadelphia Academy under Dr. Abercrombie.

Prompted largely by the desire to support his mother and sisters more liberally, he next devoted seven years to theatrical life. He says: 'In a moment of desperation I adopted the profession of an actor. It was inimical to the wishes of my mother, and in direct, opposition

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

to my own feelings and principles. But it was the only way by which I had a hope of extricating myself from my pecuniary embarrassments.' he played chiefly in Philadelphia, Baltimore and Alexandria, and succeeded much better than he expected, but at times had serious misgivings about the morality of his associations and was greatly troubled about his personal salvation. In 1813 he left the stage, to take charge of the books of the 'Baltimore American.' A year later, he became one of the proprietors and conductors of the 'Baltimore Whig,' a paper devoted to the politics of Jefferson and Madison. At that moment the country had come to war with England, and he went to the field as captain of the Baltimore Artillery Company, under William Pinckney. He stood bravely at his post during the battles at Northpoint, Bladensburg and Baltimore, when shells tore up the earth at his feet and mangled his men at his side. During the war he married, intending to spend his time in secular life, but neglected the house of God. One day his eye dropped upon an advertisement of a sale of books, which he attended, and he bought the works of John Newton. On reading the 'Life of Newton,' his mind was deeply affected; he passed through agony of soul on account of his sins, which, for a time, disqualified him for business. His young wife thought him deranged, and having sought relief in various ways, at last he flew to the Bible for direction. He says:

'One evening after the family had all retired, I went up into a vacant garret and walked backwards and forwards in great agony of mind. I kneeled down, the instance of Hezekiah occurred to me, like him I turned my face to the wall and cried for mercy. An answer seemed to be vouchsafed in an impression that just as many years as I had passed in rebellion against God, so many years I must now endure, before deliverance could be granted. I clasped my hands and

cried out, "Yes, dear Lord, a thousand years of such anguish as I now feel, if I may only be saved at last."...I felt that as a sinner I was condemned and justly exposed to immediate and everlasting destruction. I saw distinctly that in Christ alone I must be saved, if saved at all; and the view I had at that moment of Christ's method of saving sinners, I do still most heartily entertain after thirty years' experience of his love.'

Not long after this he began to preach in Washington, and so amazing was his popularity that in 1815-16 he was elected Chaplain to Congress. For a time he was pastor at Alexandria, Va., when he became assistant pastor in Oliver Street, New York, where he rose to the highest distinction as a preacher. The death of its minister, Rev. John Williams, left him sole pastor of that Church for about eighteen years, when he accepted the pastorate of the First Baptist Church, New York. For about forty years he was a leader in Home and Foreign mission work, and in the great modern movement for a purely translated Bible. In establishing our missions, many pleaded for the living teacher and cared little for the faithfully translated Bible, but he sympathized with Mr. Thomas, who, in a moment of heart-sorrow, exclaimed: 'If I had 100,000 I would give it all for a Bengali Bible.' he did much for the cause of education, but never took much interest in the scheme which associated Columbia College with the missionary field. In a letter to Dr. Bolles dated December 27, 1830, he wrote:

'The value of education I certainly appreciate, and think a preacher of the Gospel cannot know too much, although it sometimes unhappily occurs, to use the language of L. Richmond, that Christ is crucified in the pulpit between the classics and mathematics. Those missionaries destined, like Judson, to translate the word of God should be ripe scholars before this branch of their work is performed; but I am still of opinion that the learning of Dr. Gill himself would have aided him but

The American Baptists

little had he been a missionary to our American Indians.'

He was elected President of the Triennial Convention in 1832, and continued to fill that chair till 1841, when he declined a re-election. He had much to do with adjusting the working plans, first of the Triennial Convention and then of the Missionary Union. When the disruption took place between the Southern and Northern Baptists, in 1845, no one contributed more to overcome the friction and difficulties which were engendered by the new state of things and in forming the new constitution. Dr. Stow says:

'Concessions were made on all sides; but it was plain to all that the greatest was made by Mr. Cone. The next day the constitution was reported as the unanimous product of the committee. Mr. Cone made the requisite explanations, and defended every article and every provision as earnestly as if the entire instrument had been his own favorite offspring. The committee, knowing his preference for something different, were filled with admiration at the Christian magnanimity which he there exhibited. I believe he never altered his opinion that something else would have been better, but I never knew of his uttering a syllable to the disparagement of the constitution to whose unanimous adoption he contributed more largely than any other man.'

As a moderator, as an orator, as a Christian gentleman, he was of the highest order; he knew nothing of personal bitterness; he read human nature at a glance, and was one of the noblest and best abused men of his day. Like his brethren, he believed that the word 'baptize' in the Bible meant to immerse and that it was his duty to God so to preach it; but, unlike them, he believed that if it was his duty so to preach it, it was as clearly his duty so to print it; and therefor many accounted him a sinner above all who dwelt in Jerusalem. Of course, as is usual in all similar cases of detraction heaven has hallowed his memory, for his life was

moved by the very highest and purest motives.

On the 27th of May, 1850, twenty-four revisionists met in the parlor of Deacon Colgate's house, No. 128 Chambers Street, to take into consideration what present duty demanded at their hands. They were: Spencer H. Cone, Stephen Remington, Herman J. Eddy, Thomas Armitage, Wm. S. Clapp, Orrin B. Judd, Henry P. See, A.C. Wheat, Wm. Colgate, John B. Wells, Wm. D. Murphy, Jas. H. Townsend, Sylvester Pier, Jas. B. Colgate, Alex. McDonald, Geo. W. Abbe, Jas. Farquharson, and E.S. Whitney, of New York city; John Richardson, of Maine; Samuel R. Kelly and Wm. H. Wyckoff, of Brooklyn; E. Gilbert, Lewis Bedell and James Edmunds, from the interior of New York. Dr. Cone presided, E.S. Whitney served as secretary, and Deacon Colgate led in prayer. For a time this company bowed before God in silence, then this man of God poured out one of the most tender and earnest petitions before the throne of grace that can well be conceived. T. Armitage offered the following, which, after full discussion, were adopted: 'Whereas, The word and will of God, as conveyed in the inspired originals of the Old and New Testaments, are the only infallible standards of faith and practice, and therefore it is of unspeakable importance that the sacred Scriptures should be faithfully and accurately translated into every living language; and,

'Whereas, A Bible Society is bound by imperative duty to employ all the means in its power to insure that the books which it circulates as the revealed will of God to man, should be as free from error and obscurity as possible; and,

'Whereas, There is not now any general Bible Society in the country which has not more or less restricted itself by its own enactments from the discharge of this duty; therefore,

Resolved. That it is our duty to form a voluntary association for the purpose of

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

procuring and circulating the most faithful version of the sacred Scriptures in all languages.

'Resolved. That in such an association we will welcome all persons to co-operate with us, who embrace the principles upon which we propose to organize, without regard to their denominational principles in other respects.'

On the 10th of June, 1850, a very large meeting was held at the Baptist Tabernacle in Mulberry Street, New York, at which the American Bible Union was organized, under a constitution which was then adopted, and an address explaining its purposes was given to the public. Dr. Cone was elected President of the Union, Wm. H. Wyckoff, Corresponding Secretary; Deacon Colgate, Treasurer; E.S. Whitney, Recording Secretary, and Sylvester Pier, Auditor, together with a board of twenty-four managers.

The second article of the constitution defined the object of the Union thus:

'Its object shall be to procure and circulate the most faithful versions of the sacred Scriptures in all languages throughout the world.'

The address gave the broad aims of the Society more fully, and, among other things, said:

'The more accurately a version is brought to the true standard, the more accurately will it express the mind and will of God. And this is the real foundation of the sacredness of the Bible. Any regard for it founded upon the defects or faults of translation is superstition. In the consideration of this subject some have endeavored to poise the whole question of revision upon the retention or displacement of the word "baptize." But this does great injustice to our views and aims. For although we insist upon the observance of a uniform principle in the full and faithful translation of God's Word, so as to express in plain English, without ambiguity or vagueness, the exact meaning of *baptize*, as well as of all other

words relating to the Christian ordinances, yet this is but one of numerous errors, which, in our estimation, demand correction. And such are our views and principles in the prosecution of this work that, if there were no such word as "baptizo" or baptize in the Scriptures, the necessity of revising our English version would appear to us no less real and imperative.'

While many men of learning and nerve espoused the movement, a storm of opposition was raised against it from one end of the land to the other. It expressed itself chiefly in harsh words, ridicule, denunciation, appeals to ignorance, prejudice and ill temper, with now and then an attempt at scholarly refutation in a spirit much more worthy of the subject itself and the respective writers. Every consideration was presented on the subject but the main thought: that the Author of the inspired originals had the infinite right to a hearing, and that man was in duty bound to listen to his utterances, all human preference or expediency to the contrary notwithstanding. After considerable correspondence with scholars in this country and in Europe, the following general rules for the direction of translators and revisers were adopted, and many scholars on both sides of the Atlantic commenced their work on a preliminary revision of the New Testament.

Dr. Conant proceeded with the revision of the English Old Testament, aided in the Hebrew text by Dr. Rodiger, of Halle, Germany. The following were the general rules of the Union

'1. The exact meaning of the inspired text, as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were first written, must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, so far as they can be found in the vernacular tongue of these for whom the version is designed, with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness.

'2. Whenever there is a version in common use it shall be made the basis of

The American Baptists

revision, and all unnecessary interference with the established phraseology shall be avoided, and only such alteration shall be made as the exact meaning of the inspired text and the existing state of the language may require.

'3. Translations or revisions of the New Testament shall be made from the received Greek text, critically edited, with known errors corrected.'

The following were the 'Special Instructions to the – Revisers of the English New Testament:'

'1. The common English version must be the basis of the revision; the Greek text, Bagster & Son's octavo edition of 1851.

'2. Whenever an alteration from that version is made on any authority additional to that of the reviser, such authority must be cited in the manuscript, either on the same page or in an appendix.

'3. Every Greek word or phrase, in the translation of which the phraseology of the common version is changed, must be carefully examined in every other place in which it occurs in the New Testament, and the views of the reviser given as to its proper translation in each place.

'4. As soon as the revision of any one book of the New Testament is finished, it shall be sent to the Secretary of the Bible Union, or such other person as shall be designated by the Committee on Versions, in order that copies may be taken and furnished to the revisers of the other books, to be returned with their suggestions to the reviser or revisers of that book. After being re-revised, with the aid of these suggestions, a carefully prepared copy shall be forwarded to the Secretary.'

Amongst the scholars who worked on the preliminary revision in Europe were Revs. Wm. Peechey, A.M.; Jos. Angus, M.A., M.R.A.S.; T.J. Gray, D.D., Ph.D.; T. Boys, A.M.; A.S. Thelwall, M.A.; Francis Clowes, M.A.; F.W. Gotch, A.M., and Jas. Patterson, D.D. Amongst the American revisers were Drs. J.L. Dagg, John Lilhe, O.B. Judd, Philip Schaff, Joseph Muenscher, John Forsyth, W.P. Strickland and James Shannon; Profs. E.S. Gallup, E. Adkins,

M.K. Pendleton, N.H. Whiting, with Messrs. Alexander Campbell, Edward Maturin, Esq., E. Lord and S.E. Shepard. The final revision of the New Testament was committed to Drs. Conant, Hackett, Schaff and Kendrick, and was published 1865. The revisers held ecclesiastical connections in the Church of England, Old School Presbyterians, Disciples, Associate Reformed Presbyterians, Seventh-Day Baptists, American Protestant Episcopalians, Regular Baptists and German Reformed Church. Of the Old Testament books; the Union published Genesis, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job, Psalms and Proverbs, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, remaining in manuscript, with a portion of Isaiah. It also prepared an Italian and Spanish New Testament, the latter being prepared by Don Juan De Calderon, of the Spanish Academy. Also a New Testament in the Chinese written character, and another in the colloquial for Ningpo; one in the Siamese, and another in the Squa Karen, besides sending a large amount of money for versions amongst the heathen, through the missionaries and missionary societies. It is estimated that about 750,000 copies of the newly translated or revised versions of the Scriptures, mostly of the New Testament, were circulated by the Union. Its tracts, pamphlets, addresses, reports and revisions so completely revolutionized public opinion on the subject of revision that a new literature was created on the subject, both in England and America, and a general demand for revision culminated in action on that subject by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1870.

As early as 1856 great alarm was awakened at the prospect that the American Bible Union would translate the Greek word 'baptize' into English, instead of transferring it, and the 'London Times' of that year remarked that there were already 'several distinct movements in favor of a revision of the authorized version' of 1611. The 'Edinburgh Review' and many

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

similar periodicals took strong ground for its revision, and in 1858, Dr. Trench, then Dean of Westminster, issued an elaborate treatise showing the imperfect state of the commonly received version, and the urgent need of its revision, in which he said: 'Indications of the interest which it is awakening reach us from every side. America is sending us the installments – it must be owned not very encouraging ones – of a new version as fast as she can...I am persuaded that a revision ought to come. I am convinced that it will come. The wish for a revision has for a considerable time been working among dissenters here; by the voice of one of these it has lately made itself known in Parliament, and by the mouth of a Regius Professor in Convocation.' The revision of the Bible Union was a sore thorn in his side; and in submitting a plan of revision in the last chapter, in which he proposed to invite the Biblical scholars of 'the land to assist with their suggestions here, even though they might not belong to the church,' of course they would be asked as scholars, not as dissenters, he adds: 'Setting aside, then, the so-called Baptists, who, of course, could not be invited, seeing that they demand not 'a translation of the Scripture but an interpretation, and that in their own sense.' Some Baptist writer had denied in the 'Freeman' of November 17, 1858, that the Baptists desired to disturb the word 'baptize' in the English version, but the Dean was so alarmed about their putting an 'interpretation' into the text instead of a transfer, that he said in a second edition, in 1859 (page 210): 'I find it hard to reconcile this with the fact that in their revision (Bible Union) *baptizo* is always changed into immerse, and *baptism* into immersion.' The pressure of public sentiment, however, compelled him to call for revision, for he said: 'However we may be disposed to let the subject alone, it will not let us alone. It has been too effectually stirred ever again to go to sleep; and

the difficulties, be they few or many, will have one day to be encountered. The time will come when the inconveniences of remaining where we are will be so manifestly greater than the inconveniences of action, that this last will become inevitable.'

The whole subject came up before the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury in February, 1870, when one of the most memorable discussions took place that ever agitated the Church of England, in which those who conceded the desirableness of revision took ground; and amongst them the Bishop of Lincoln, that the American movement necessitated the need of prompt action on the part of the Church of England. In May of the same year the Convocation resolved:

'That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.'

The chief rules on which the revision was to be made were the first and fifth, namely:

'1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the authorized version consistently with faithfulness. 5. To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision by each company, except two thirds of these present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.'

The revisers commenced their work in June, 1870, and submitted the New Testament complete May 17th, 1881, the work being done chiefly by seventeen Episcopalians, two of the Scotch Church, two dissenting Presbyterians, one Unitarian, one Independent and one Baptist. A board of American scholars had co-operated, and submitted 'a list of readings and renderings' which they preferred to those finally

adopted by their English brethren; a list comprising fourteen separate classes of passages, running through the entire New Testament, besides several hundred separate words and phrases. The Bible Union's New Testament was published nearly six years before the Canterbury revision was begun, and nearly seventeen years before it was given to the world. Although Dr. Trench had pronounced the 'installments' of the American Bible Union's New Testament 'not very encouraging,' yet the greatest care was had to supply the English translators with that version. During the ten and a half years consumed in their work, they met in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster each month for ten months of every year, each meeting lasting four days, each day from eleven o'clock to six; and the Bible Union's New Testament lay on their table all that time, being most carefully consulted before changes from the common version were agreed upon. One of the best scholars in the corps of English revisers said to the writer: 'We never make an important change without consulting the Union's version. Its changes are more numerous than ours, but four out of five changes are in exact harmony with it, and I am mortified to say that the pride of English scholarship will not allow us to give due credit to that superior version for its aid.' This was before the Canterbury version was completed, but when it was finished it was found that the changes in sense from the common version were more numerous than those of the Union's version, and that the renderings in that version are verbatim in hundreds of cases with those of the Union's version. In the March 'Contemporary Review,' 1882, Canon Farrar cites twenty-four cases in which the Canterbury version renders the 'aorist' Greek tense more accurately and in purer English than does the common version. He happily denominates all these cases 'baptismal aorists,' because they

refer to the initiatory Christian rite in its relations to Christ's burial and resurrection. Yet, seventeen years before the Canterbury revisers finished their work, the Bible Union's version contained nineteen of these renderings as they are found in the Canterbury version, without the variation of a letter, while three others vary but slightly, and in the last case, which reads in the common version 'have obeyed,' and in the Canterbury 'became obedient,' it is rendered more tersely, in the Union's version, simply 'obeyed.'

Much as Dr. Trench was disquieted about the word 'immerse' being 'an interpretation' and 'not a translation of' *baptizo*, he was not content to let the word 'baptize' rest quietly and undisturbed in the English version, when compelled to act on honest scholarship, but inserted the preposition 'in' as a marginal 'interpretation' of its bearings, baptized 'in water.' Dr. Eadie, one of his fellow-revisers, who died in 1876, six years after the commencement of his work, complained bitterly of the American translation, which he was perpetually consulting in the Jerusalem Chamber. He also published two volumes on the 'Need of Revising the English New Testament,' and says (ii, p. 360): 'The Baptist translation of the American Bible Union is more than faithful to anti-Paedobaptist opinions. It professedly makes the Bible the book of a sect,' because it supplanted the word *baptize* by the word *immerse*. Yet, Dr. Scott, still another of the revisers, so well known in connection with 'Liddell and Scott's Lexicon,' worked side by side with both of them, and said in that lexicon that 'baptiso' meant 'to dip under water,' and Dean Stanley, still a third reviser, and the compeer of both, said: 'On philological grounds it is quite correct to translate John the Baptist by John the Immerser;' while the board of seventeen American revisers, representing the various religious bodies, united in

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

recommending that the preposition 'in water' be introduced into the text, instead of 'with.'

[Note: The information Armitage gives on this debate is very important, but he fails to give the whole picture of the battle over the Bible in the 19th century. The debate over whether to translate or to transliterate the Greek word "baptizo" in the English Bible was an interesting sideline of that battle, but it was only one small part of the overall struggle. He fails to discuss the serious textual side of the issue. The English Revision of 1881 did not merely make a few changes and corrections to the Authorized Version to update the language and correct any obvious mistakes, it replaced the Received Greek New Testament with the Westcott-Hort New Testament founded upon the Griesbach-type principles of rationalistic modern textual criticism. The American Bible Union version also incorporated innovations from the critical Greek text. A more detailed history of these events is found in the following book: *For Love of the Bible: The Defense of the King James Bible and the Received Text from 1800 to Present* by D.W. Cloud, Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277.]

After the separation between the American and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Union, the former continued to do a great and good work in Bible circulation and in aiding the translation of missionary versions. Dr. Welsh continued to act as its president for many years. For holy boldness, thrilling originality, artless simplicity and seraphic fervor, he was one of the marvelous preachers of his day, so that it was a heavenly inspiration to listen to his words. Both these societies continued their operations till 1883, with greatly diminished receipts, from various causes, and the Bible Union was much embarrassed by debt, when it was believed that the time had come for the Baptists of America

to heal their divisions on the Bible question, to reunite their efforts in Bible work, and to leave each man in the denomination at liberty to use what English version he chose. With this end in view, the largest Bible Convention that had ever met amongst Baptists convened at Saratoga on May 22, 1883, and, after two days' discussion and careful conference, it was unanimously resolved:

'That in the translation of foreign versions the precise meaning of the original text should be given, and that whatever organization should be chosen as the most desirable for the prosecution of home Bible work, the commonly received version, the Anglo-American, with the corrections of the American revisers incorporated in the text, and the revisions of the American Bible Union, should be circulated.'

It also resolved:

'That in the judgment of this Convention the Bible work of Baptists should be done by our two existing Societies; the foreign work by the American Baptist Missionary Union, and the home work by the American Baptist Publication Society.'

Although the American Bible Union had always disclaimed that it was a Baptist Society, yet, a large majority of its life members and directors being Baptists, in harmony with the expressed wish of the denomination to do the Bible work of Baptists through the Missionary Union and the Publication Society, the Bible Union disposed of all its book-stock and plates to the Publication Society, on condition that its versions should be published according to demand. The American and Foreign Bible Society did the same, and now, in the English tongue, the Publication Society is circulating, according to demand, the issues of the Bible Union, the commonly received version and the Canterbury revision, with the emendations recommended by the American corps of

scholars incorporated into the text; and so it has come to pass that the denomination which refused to touch English revision in 1850 came, in less than a quarter of a century, to put its imprint upon two, to pronounce them fit for use amongst Baptists, and to circulate them cheerfully.

Next to Dr. Cone, the three men who did more to promote the revision of the English Bible than any others, were Drs. Archibald Maclay, William H. Wyckoff, and Deacon William Colgate. Archibald Maclay, D.D., was born in Scotland in 1778, and in early life became a Congregational pastor there; but after his emigration to New York and a most useful pastorate there amongst that body he became a Baptist, moved by the highest sense of duty to Christ. For thirty-two years he was the faithful pastor of the Mulberry Street Church, and left His pastorate at the earnest solicitation of the American and Foreign Bible Society to become its General Agent. In this work his labors were more abundant than they had ever been, for he pleaded for a pure Bible everywhere, by address and pen, with great power and access. In Great Britain and in all parts of the United States and Canada he was known and beloved as a sound divine and a fervent friend of the uncorrupted word of God. At the age of eighty-two years, on the 22d of May, 1860, he fell asleep, venerated by all who knew him for his learning, zeal and purity. William H. Wyckoff, LL.D., was endowed with great intellectual powers, and graduated at Union College in 1828. His early life was spent as a classical tutor, when he first became the founder and editor of the 'Baptist Advocate;' then, in turn, the Corresponding Secretary of the American and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Union. He served the latter until his death, at the age of three score and ten, in November, 1877, and his Secretaryship over these two bodies covered forty and two

consecutive years. Deacon William Colgate was one of the most consecrate and noble-laymen in the Church of Christ, to whose memory such an able volume even as that of Dr. Everts, recounting the events of his life, can do but scant justice. He was born in Kent, England, in 1783, came to this country and established a large business in New York, which by his thrift and skill endowed him with abundant means for doing good. His elevated character and Christ-like spirit led him to the noblest acts of benevolence in the building up of Christian Churches, schools for the education of young ministers, the missionary enterprise and the relief of the poor. A pure Bible was as dear to him as his life, and few men have done more to give it to the world. He was the treasurer for numbers of benevolent societies, and one of the most liberal supporters of them all. He closed his useful and beautiful life on the 25th of March, 1857, at the age of seventy-four years.

This chapter can scarcely be closed more appropriately than by a brief notice of four devoted Baptists, translators of the sacred Scriptures, in whose work and worth the denomination may feel an honest pride.

The veteran translator, Thomas J. Conant, D.D., was born at Brandon, Vt., in 1802. He graduated at Middleburg College in 1823, after which he spent two years, as resident graduate, in the daily reading of Greek authors with the Greek professor and in the study of the Hebrew under Mr. Turner, tutor in the ancient languages. In 1825 he became the Greek and Latin tutor in Columbian College, where he remained two years, when he took the professorship of Greek and Latin in the College at Waterville, where he continued six years. He then retired, devoting two years to the study of the Arabic, Syriac and Chaldee languages, availing himself of the aids rendered by Harvard, Newton and Andover. After this he

accepted the professorship of Hebrew in Madison University, and that of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary connected therewith, in 1835. He continued these labors for fifteen years with large success and honor. In 1841-42 he spent eighteen months in Germany, chiefly in Berlin, in the study of the Arabic, Ethiopic and Sanscrit. From 1850 to 1857 he was the professor of Hebrew, Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Rochester Theological Seminary, and stood in the front rank of American Hebraists with Drs. Turner and Stuart. Since 1857 Dr. Conant has devoted himself almost exclusively to the great work of his life, the translation and revision of the common English version of the Scriptures. He became thoroughly convinced as far back as the year 1827, on a critical comparison of that version with the earlier ones on which it was based, that it should be thoroughly revised, since which time he has made all his studies subsidiary to that end. Yet, amongst his earliest works, he gave to our country his translation of Gesenius' 'Hebrew Grammar,' with grammatical exercises and a chrestomathy by the translator; but his revision of the Bible, done for the American Bible Union, is the invaluable work of his life. This comprises the entire New Testament with the following books of the Old, namely: Genesis, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Job, Psalms, Proverbs and a portion of Isaiah. Many of these are accompanied with invaluable critical and philological notes, and are published with the Hebrew and English text in parallel columns. His work known as 'Baptizein,' which is a monograph of that term, philologically and historically investigated, and which demonstrates its uniform sense to be immerse, must remain a monument to this distinguished Oriental scholar, while men are interested in its bearing on the exposition of Divine truth. Like

all other truly great men, Dr. Conant is very unassuming and affable, and as much athirst as ever for new research. He keeps his investigations fully up with the advance of the age, and hails every new manifestation of truth from the old sources with the zest of a thirsty traveler drinking from an undefiled spring. In his mellowness of age, scholarship and honor, he awaits the call of his Lord with that healthy and cheerful hope expressed in his own sweet translation of Job 5:26: 'Thou shalt come to the grave in hoary age, as a sheaf is gathered in its season.'

Howard Osgood, D.D., was born in the parish of Plaquemines, La., January, 1831. He pursued his academical studies at the Episcopal Institute, Flushing, N.Y., and subsequently entered Harvard College, where he graduated with honors in 1850, being marked for accurate scholarship, a maturity of thought and a sobriety of judgment. Subsequently, he became much interested in the study of the Hebrew and cognate languages under the instruction of Jewish scholars, which studies he also pursued in Germany for about three years. On his return to America, he became dissatisfied with the teachings of the Episcopal Church, to which he was then united, as to the Christian ordinances, and in 1856 he was baptized on a confession of Christ into the fellowship of the Oliver Street Baptist Church, New York, by Dr. E.L. Magoon. He was ordained the same year as pastor of the Baptist Church at Flushing, N.Y., which he served from 1856 to 1858, when he became pastor of the North Church, New York city, which he served from 1860 to 1865. He was elected professor of Hebrew Literature in Crozer Theological Seminary in 1868, where he remained until 1874, when he took the same chair in the Rochester Theological Seminary, which he still fills. He was appointed one of the revisers of the Old Testament (American Committee) and was abundant in his labors, his

sagacity and scholarship being highly appreciated by his distinguished colleagues. He has written much on Oriental subjects, chiefly for the various Reviews; he is also the author of 'Jesus Christ and the Newer School of Criticism,' 1883; and of the 'Pre-historic Commerce of Israel,' 1885. He translated Pierrot's 'Dogma of the Resurrection among the Ancient Egyptians,' 1885.

Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., LL.D. He was a native of Salisbury, Mass., born December 27, 1808. He became a pupil first in the Amesbury and then in the Phillips Academy. After graduating from Amherst College, he entered the Theological Seminary at Andover, his school years extending from 1821 to 1834. In 1834 he became the classical tutor in Mount Hope College, Baltimore. He was a Congregationalist at that time and had preached to a Church in Calais, Me.; but in 1835, after thorough investigation and on deep conviction, he became a Baptist and united with the First Church, Baltimore. The same year he was chosen professor of Latin in Brown University, and in 1838 professor of Hebrew, also. Leaving Brown in 1839, he took the professorship of Biblical Literature and Interpretation in the Newton Theological Institution. He spent 1841-42 at Halle and Berlin, pursuing linguistic and Biblical studies, attending the lectures of Tholuck, Gesenius, Neander and Hengstenberg. His labors were continued at Newton for twenty-nine years, but in 1852 he traveled in Egypt and Palestine, studying the antiquities of those countries, after which he published his 'Illustrations of Scriptures.' In 1858 he had become greatly interested in the revision of the English Scriptures and he accepted an appointment as reviser from the American Bible Union with such enthusiasm that he spent some time in Greece, mingling especially with the people of Athens, for the purpose of catching the grace and rhythm of the modern

Greek, which he thought a helpful interpreter of the ancient language. He went out under the auspices of the Union, and shortly after his return published an enlarged edition of his 'Commentary on the Acts.' After mature consideration he resigned his professorship at Newton, in 1867, to devote all his time to the revision of the English Bible. He unbosomed himself on this subject, in his immortal address delivered before the Bible Union, in New York, August 6th, 1859, when it was charged by the ignorant or designing that the Union and its work were 'sectarian.' He nobly said:

'I agree with the sentiments of one of the Christian denominations; and if I have any sentiments at all, how, I beg to ask, could I entertain the sentiments of all the different denominations at the same time? But am I, therefore, necessarily sectarian because I thus differ from others, any more than they are sectarian because they differ from me? Or am I sectarian at all, in any sense, to disqualify me for the performance of this work, so far forth merely as my religious views are concerned? To what, I pray, does this charge of sectarianism reduce itself? Is not a man who undertakes this labor to have any religious convictions? Would you entrust it to those who have no fixed religious belief? Is it not evident that nothing can ever be done here unless it be done by those who have some definite religious opinions? If, then, you would not employ men utterly destitute of religious convictions to perform so religious and Christian a work, and if believing men cannot be expected to believe any thing where opinions clash, what remains? The translator must sympathize with some one religious body rather than another; and if that body is the Episcopalian or Congregationalist or Methodist, I would not say that a translation from a member of these sects was necessarily any more sectarian than if it was from the hand of a Baptist; and, vice versa, I see not with what propriety some persons are pleased to stigmatize the publications of this Society as necessarily sectarian, if they come from Baptists, and not from our Episcopalian or

Chapter 17 - Bible Translation and Bible Societies

Congregationalist brethren...A given rendering of a passage which favors one creed more than another is not on that account merely a sectarian rendering; it is the adoption of a rendering against the evidence, or without sufficient evidence, which makes the rendering sectarian. If you complain of a rendering as sectarian, refute it; show that the reasons alleged for it are futile or insufficient, and that the evidence of philology demands a different one, and that the man, therefore, is blinded to the light by partiality or prejudice. When a case like that is made out, you may fix there the brand of sectarianism; but not otherwise...I should esteem it as disloyal and reprehensible in myself, as in any other person, to twist or force in the slightest degree any passage, or word of a passage, in the Bible, for the purpose of upholding my own individual sentiments; or those of any party It is an act of simple justice to say, that the managers of this Society have left me as free in this respect as the air we breathe. They have imposed upon me no condition or restraint whatever. They have merely said to me: "Study God's Word with painstaking and care; endeavor to ascertain, as accountable not unto men but to the Supreme Judge of all, what that Word means, and then what the Bible is found to mean, that let the Bible say."

Dr. Hackett translated the Epistle to Philemon, the Book of Ruth, and spent a number of years upon the final revision of the New Testament, especially upon the Acts of the Apostles. He was the editor-in-chief of the American edition of Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' and so well was his work done that Canon Westcott discarded the English edition for his. Dr. Hackett filled the chair of Biblical Literature and New Testament Exegesis in Rochester Theological Seminary from 1870 to his death in 1875. Only once in an age is such a man granted to the world. With the tenderness of a woman, the artlessness of a babe and the learning of a sage he blended the most modest humility, and yet his speech was wrapt in fire. The writer once consulted him officially, asking

him to assist Dr. Conant on the Old Testament. On opening the subject, he began to bewail that other work had compelled him to lay aside his Hebrew studies for a time, and he said: 'I am really becoming rusty in the Hebrew, and should shrink to work side by side with the doctor on the Old Testament.' But in a moment the thought of returning to this delightful field of toil seized him, and he burst into an astonishing eulogy of that ancient tongue, as if glowing under the rhapsodies of prophetic warmth. He had struck a theme which aroused his unambitious spirit, his eye flashed, his speech became vivid, delicate, eloquent. Then, at once, with a nervous timidity, he checked himself and said, with the strange pleasantry of confidence and distrust: 'However, if it is for the best, I will try to assist the doctor, though not worthy to unloose his Hebrew sandal. Still, I must honestly say that, for all that, I really believe I could hold my own with him in the Greek.'

Asahel C. Kendrick, D.D., LL.D., was born at Pouitney, Vt., December, 1809, and when very young became a pupil of his uncle, Dr. Kendrick, at Hamilton, K.Y. He graduated from the Hamilton College, at Clinton, N.Y., in 1831, and served with high distinction as Professor of the Greek language and literature in Madison University from 1831 to 1850, when he accepted the Greek professorship in the Rochester University, where he still remains. He passed the years 1852-54 in Europe, visiting the German Universities, spending also a considerable time at Athens in the study of modern Greek. From early life he has been deeply interested in the translation and revision of the English Bible, contributing most valuable aid in that work, both for the Bible Union and as a member of the American Committee in the Canterbury revision. He is the author of several philological works, amongst them an 'Introduction to the Greek Language,' which

The American Baptists

work reached a second edition in 1855. He is also the translator and editor of Olshausen's 'Commentary of the New Testament,' and of Lange's 'Biblical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.' As a biographer and poet he excels, as is seen in his attractive 'Memoir of Emily C. Judson,' and his volume of poems called 'Echoes.' Dr. Kendrick has no superior in Greek scholarship in this country, and although he never was a pastor, he has few equals as an exegete in the New Testament.

The Bible Revision Association, which was organized at Memphis, Tenn., in 1852, rendered great aid in the revision of the English Scriptures. It co-operated with the American Bible Union in that work, and confined its field of operation to the Southern States, and was located at Louisville, Ky. Many of the ablest men in those States were enrolled in its membership, and the distinguished John L. Waller was its first President, filling the office till his death in 1854. As an author, a debater, and an orator he had few equals and no superior in the Kentucky ministry. Drs. S.W. Lynd, D. It. Campbell, W. Gary Crane, John L. Dagg, Samuel Baker, J. It. Graves, and N.M. Crawford were all earnest and eloquent advocates of a faithful Bible. They have nearly all gone to their eternal rest, but their principles were divine and their works follow them. James Edmonds, Esq., was the first Corresponding Secretary of the Revision Association, and one of its ablest advocates.

After the test of half a century, Baptists are more firmly persuaded than ever that their stand taken on the principle of Bible translation is thoroughly sound. Then, much of the old nonsense as to the application of this principle to the English Bible has happily passed away, and those who believe in the home use of immersionist versions are no longer counted as holding rather close relationship with him of reputed hoofs and horns. The random talk of some Baptists thirty years ago left the impression that they would rather die in valiant martyr-hood than give transfer versions to our Churches in Asia, and at the same time, that they would endure martyrdom twice over rather than give any other sort of versions to our American Churches! Others could not so entirely crucify their selfishness as to demand renderings from their missionaries in heathen languages, the like of which they would spurn with contempt if they were put into their own mother-tongue. On this point, singularly, there is some difference yet, but on the character of foreign versions there is now but one view. They are sustained with the united Baptist hand and heart, and are likely to be, until all who reverence the inspired originals come to consider the versions of Judson and Carey as properly stamped with the catholicity of those originals; a claim which will entitle them to the first place in the univocal versions of the entire earth.

Chapter 18 - Baptists in British America and Australia

In tracing the progress of Baptist principles through the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada, we may begin with NOVA SCOTIA, which came under the British flag in 1713. English settlers, mostly Episcopalians, founded Halifax about 1749; Lunenburg was settled, principally by French and Germans, in 1753; and in 1759, after the expulsion of the Acadians, the influx from the New England colonies began. In a quarter of a century after that, Horton, Cornwallis, Yarmouth, Truro, Granville, Annapolis, Pictou and many other towns were settled by New Englanders. Many Lutherans settled in Lunenburg, and many Presbyterians from Scotland and the North of Ireland in Londonderry, Truro and Pictou, while the great body of emigrants from the American colonies were Congregationalists. The first House of Assembly, 1758, passed an act which made the Church of England the Established Church, but granting liberty of conscience to all other denominations, Roman Catholics excepted; marriage, however, could be celebrated only by the ministers of the Established Church. Many years and struggles were passed before this distinction was wiped from the statute-book.

Shubael Dimock, of Mansfield, Conn., had become a 'Separatist,' and held religious meetings apart from the Standing Order, for which he was whipped and thrown into prison; his son Daniel had renounced infant baptism. They settled in Newport, N.S., in 1760, where Daniel was immersed by Mr. Sutton in 1763, and he immersed his own father some years later. Several other converts to Baptist views resided in Newport, but they did not organize a Baptist Church there at that time. Rev. John Sutton was from New Jersey, and soon returned thither. In 1761 Rev. Ebenezer Moulton, of South Brimfield, Mass., settled in Yarmouth with other emigrants. After preaching there for

two years, he visited Horton and labored in that vicinity, but seems to have formed no Church. These are the first Baptists of whom we have any records in Nova Scotia. So far as can be ascertained, the first Baptist Church in British America was planted in New Brunswick in 1763, and was an offshoot of the Second Church in Swansea, Mass., and of two or three neighboring Churches. A company of thirteen Baptists formed themselves into a Church, with Nathan Mason as their pastor, and, leaving Swansea, settled in what is now Sackville, where they continued to reside for nearly eight years, during which time their Church increased to about sixty members. But, owing to some dissatisfaction with their new location, the pastor and the original founders of the Church returned to Massachusetts in 1771, and, so far as appears, the Church at Sackville was scattered. Some think that Mr. Moulton formed a Church at Horton, but Dr. Cramp says: 'There was no Baptist Church till after the appearance of Henry Alline...While Mr. Button remained here he preached and baptized; the Dimocks and Mr. Moulton did the same, but separate action as Baptists was deferred till a more favorable conjunction of circumstances.' The Congregationalists had established Churches in various places, and the Baptists seem to have united with these, for, about the year 1776, there were two or three Churches in Nova Scotia made up of Baptists and Congregationalists, while a number of unorganized Baptists were found in various localities.

At this juncture Henry Alline, a 'New Light' preacher of extraordinary power, appeared in the province and left a lasting impression upon its religious institutions. He was born at Newport, R.I., in 1748, and removed to Falmouth, N.S., in 1760. He was converted when twenty-seven years of age, and after some

unsuccessful attempts at securing an education he began to preach. He was very successful, traveling from place to place for nearly eight years, until New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were astir with religious revivals, the souls of the people being thrilled by his homely but pungent eloquence. He was a Congregationalist, but held the questions of Church order and ordinances as secondary matters. He seldom administered baptism, yet was willing that his converts should be immersed, if they chose, after thorough conversion. In fervency, power and doctrine he seems to have been of the Whitefield stamp. At the age of thirty-six years he died in Northampton, 1784. The ministry of this New Light apostle affected the progress of Baptist doctrines in two diverse ways. It infused a new and spiritual life into the languishing Churches, and his lax views on Church order and discipline told powerfully against all rigid and tyrannical organization. His converts were generally formed into Congregational Churches, some being baptized and others not, until in due time numbers of them appear to have seen the need of greater conformity to Gospel faith and practice, and at first resolved themselves into Baptist Churches, naturally enough of the open-communion order. Most of the Canadian Churches practiced open communion till the commencement of this century, and many of them till a later period. Some of the strongest Churches of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia came out of this Alline movement, all of them observing strict communion today. The Horton Church was one of these. It seems to have oscillated for a few years, but in 1809 it took the full Baptist ground. In this respect the Cornwallis, Chester, Argyle, First Halifax and other Churches differ little from the Horton Church, having gradually made their way to their present stand.

The first Association of Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was projected

in 1797 and was fully organized in 1800, at Granville, Annapolis County. In the main its work differed slightly from that of present associations. It threw strong guards around the fundamental independence of the individual Church, stating that it 'pretends to no other powers than those of an advisory council, utterly disclaiming all superiority, jurisdiction, coercion, right or infallibility.' For more than a quarter of a century, however, it examined and ordained candidates for the ministry. But, gradually, its leading minds became convinced that the New Testament rested the power of ordination in the independent and self-governing Church. 'Father Manning' stated the principle quaintly in an address to the Association thus: 'I have observed that representative bodies, the world over, are very much inclined to take to themselves horns, and to so use them as to destroy the liberties of the people. An Association, therefore, must not put on horns.' After 1827 the Association ceased to ordain pastors, missionaries and evangelists, leaving that matter where it belongs, in the hands of the individual churches. The question of communion was also much debated, and in 1809 the Association resolved that in the future no open-communion Church should belong to that body. Four Churches withdrew on this account, and from that time restricted communion has been the rule.

In 1821 the Association, for convenience, divided into the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Associations, one for each province, and in 1850 the Nova Scotia portion subdivided into the Eastern, Central and Western Associations, as at this time. The New Brunswick Association also divided into the Eastern and Western in 1847, but in 1868 there was yet another new departure. Up to this time the Prince Edward Island Churches had been in the Eastern Nova Scotia Association, but they now organized one of their own, with thirteen

Churches. The Southern Baptist Association of New Brunswick was formed in 1850, and in 1885 these seven Associations, from these small beginnings, numbered 352 Churches; with 40,984 members. Some of the fathers who laid these broad foundations were most remarkable men. As pioneers they were marked by breadth of view, singleness and steadfastness of purpose and a Christ-like self-denial. The names of Thomas H. Chipman, Theodore and Harris Harding, Edward and James Manning and Joseph Dimock will ever be worthy of the highest honor. These and many more were all of one spirit and endowed with a great diversity of gifts, but, by universal consent, probably Edward Manning would rank amongst the first.

He was converted under the preaching of Henry Alline, and in coming to the light passed through a 'horror of great darkness.' He traveled through these provinces in evangelistic labors, often on snow shoes in the depth of winter, to preach Jesus and the resurrection. His first pastorate, 1795, was over the mixed Church in Cornwallis, and for three years after his ordination he was greatly agitated on the subject of baptism, but at last he went to Annapolis and was immersed by T.H. Chipman. Soon after he renounced open communion, and with seven members of his Church separated from the main body. He continued in his pastorate till his death in 1851, and amongst his last words were these: 'Oh! the infinite greatness and grandeur of God.' He was imbued with deep piety and fervency of spirit; he was a champion of religious liberty, and possibly surpassed all his brethren in profundity and logical power. As a 'dissenting' preacher, he met with stern opposition and persecution from those of the Established Church, meeting the harsher intolerance of New Brunswick with the firmness of a man born to rule his own spirit.

Theodore Seth Harding was another Gospel

warrior of these days. His first religious impressions were received under the ministry of Mr. Alline, when at the age of eight, but he was converted under the powerful preaching of Rev. Freeborn Garretson, a Methodist missionary from the United States, who was sent to Nova Scotia in 1787. Mr. Harding was ordained as pastor of the Horton Baptist Church in 1796, and remained its pastor until his death, in 1855. But like Manning and others, he extended his labors in every direction, even to the United States. In intellect he was not the peer of Manning, but far surpassed him in fluency and other elements of oratorical power, so that as a preacher he had few equals anywhere.

Joseph Dimock was the son of Daniel, who baptized his father when he fled for refuge from Connecticut. Joseph was ordained as pastor at Chester, in 1793, and although he made long missionary tours in all directions, he remained its pastor till his death, in 1847. He met with great opposition in his work. At Lunenburg infuriated mobs, maddened with liquor, determined to inflict personal violence upon him, but his firmness awed them and his gentleness disarmed their wrath. These are selected as types out of a large body of powerful and self-denying men, who have left the marvelous record of their work in these provinces.

The Baptist press of Canada had its inception in the Nova Scotia Association, in 1825, which voted to 'Request the Baptist Association of New Brunswick to unite with us in the publication of a Religious Periodical Magazine.' From this action sprang the 'Baptist Missionary Magazine,' of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in 1827. It was a quarterly, published at St. John, N.B., and edited by Rev. Charles Tupper, and was continued until January, 1837, when it gave place to the 'Christian Messenger,' a weekly, published at Halifax, N.S. From that time it has rendered

noble service to all our denominational interests, and still exists in combination with the 'Christian Visitor,' at St. John, N.B. The 'Christian Visitor' was established in 1848, and was conducted by Rev. E.D. Very, who was drowned in the Bay of Minas, in 1852, when returning from a geological excursion, in company with Professor Chipman and four students of Acadia College, all of whom perished. For a time the paper was conducted by Messrs. Samuel Robinson and I.E. Bill. After a time, Rev. Dr. Bill assumed full charge as proprietor and editor, and conducted this journal with marked ability, but in 1885 the two papers were purchased by a company, and united under the editorship of Rev. Calvin Goodspeed as the 'Messenger and Visitor,' published at St. John, N.B.

The first regular Missionary Society of the Nova Scotia Baptists began in 1815, when the Association, meeting at Cornwallis, 'Voted, that the Association is considered a Missionary Society, and with them is left the whole management of the mission business.' A contribution of \$118,60 was made at this session for sending a missionary eastward of Halifax. From time to time the Association sent out missionaries, and in 1820 the first Home Mission Board was appointed in New Brunswick. 'Mite Societies' were formed in the Churches which were of great utility. The Female Mite Society of the Germain Street Church, in St. John, contributed \$60, that year, a degree of liberality which, if attained by all the Churches at this time, would fill the mission treasury to repletion. The first Nova Scotia 'Society for the maintenance of Foreign Missions' was formed at the Chester meeting of the Association, 1838, and a Foreign Mission Board was appointed soon after in New Brunswick. Burma was chosen as the field of labor, and the first missionary sent out was Rev. R.E. Burpee, in 1845; he died in 1850. After his

death the Provincial Board sent money annually to support native preachers, under the care of Rev. A.R.R. Crawley, of Henthada. Dr. Tupper was for many years the Secretary of the Foreign Board. His life was a wonderful triumph of energy and industry. His schooling was limited to ten weeks after he was ten years of age, and yet by dint of self-education he became proficient in many languages: Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, English, German, Italian, Syriac and one or two others, and it is said that he read the New Testament in the first three of these at least one hundred times. At the Jubilee of his ordination Dr. Tupper stated, that as a minister he had traveled in fifty years 146,000 miles, principally on horseback, had preached 6,750 sermons, attended and generally taken part in 3,430 other meetings, had made 11,520 family visits, married 238 couples, had conducted 542 funerals, and baptized 522 converts. Surely, if works save men, Brother Tupper's chance should be better than that of some Canadian brethren, however it may be with those of the United States. Dr. S.T. Rand's name forms an important leaf in the Indian missionary history of the Maritime Provinces, especially amongst the Micmacs. He has pursued this work during the greater part of his life, with indomitable perseverance and chiefly at his own charges.

Our brethren have also done an immense work in these Provinces by their educational institutions. Their fathers, generally, knew nothing of the learning of the schools, yet their interest in laying the foundations of these schools was unique rather than remarkable. They early saw that if the denomination was to do its Master's work in the most efficient manner, they must make early provision for the Christian education of the Churches, especially for an educated ministry. The venerable 'Father Munro' gave this terse expression to their common conviction: 'The man who successfully succeeds me in the pastoral office

must stand on my shoulders.' It is probable that the first suggestion of a Baptist institution of learning for these Provinces was made by Edward Manning, and when the subject came up for discussion he pondered every point, and corresponded largely with the brethren in the United States on the matter. The way was dark, the Baptists were a feeble folk to undertake such a work, yet a series of events occurred between 1820-50 which facilitated the project. The founding of the Granville Street Church at Halifax by a number of members seceding from the Church of England gave force to the movement. The Crawley family and others amongst them were educated, and were ready to give their influence in this direction. The remarkable revival of 1828 brought a number of educated men into the Baptist Churches and ministry, who became active workers in the cause of education – such men as John Pryor, E.A. Crawley, William Chipman, Ingraham E. Bill and others. The Granville Street Church was admitted into the Association in 1828, at its meeting in Horton, at which time the Prospectus of the Nova Scotia Baptist Education Society was drawn up and submitted by the Halifax messengers of the Church there. The Society aimed to establish a seminary of learning, and to aid indigent young men in studying for the ministry. Their action will appear sufficiently courageous when it is taken into the account that twenty-nine little Churches, numbering in all 1,772 members, formed their entire strength. The first result was the establishment of the Academy at Horton, with Rev. William Pryor as Principal. This school has continued ever since, and is perpetually fitting men for College life and all the various fields of usefulness.

The Baptists of New Brunswick numbered but about 2,000 in 1834, when they followed the example of their Nova Scotia brethren and opened a 'Seminary' in Fredericton. In 1842 the

Rev. Charles Spurden, of Hereford, England, was appointed principal, which position he held for twenty-five years. Dr. Spurden was greatly endeared to his students and his brethren generally by his literary attainments and lovable qualities of character; he died in 1876, after a short pastorate in the Fredericton Church. The Seminary did good service under other principals, but it was closed after many years of financial struggle, and within a few years another has been opened at St. John, under more favorable conditions; from its opening it has had a female department. A female seminary was opened in 1861, in connection with the Horton (Wolfville) School, and is still in vigorous operation. The intolerance of the dominant Church had much to do with the founding of denominational schools and colleges. Early in the history of Nova Scotia, King's College was founded at Windsor, under the aegis of the English Church, which admitted no student except on subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles. Dalhousie College was founded in 1820, with public funds, ostensibly as a non-sectarian University for the Province. But when it was opened the classical chair was refused to Rev. E.A. Crawley, for the sole reason, as Dr. Bill states: 'That these in charge felt bound, as they said, to connect the college exclusively with the Kirk of Scotland.' Thus mocked, the friends of Baptist education found it time to bestir themselves, and the result was a determination to found a college of their own, hence the origin of Acadia College. In addition to the great burden of raising the necessary funds by so feeble a folk, their task was increased by the difficulty of obtaining the requisite charter. Their foes raised a popular cry against the multiplication of feeble colleges, until the spirit of the Baptists was thoroughly aroused, when they resolved to maintain their right to possess such an institution if they paid for it with their own money. The Committee of

their Educational Society went to Halifax in a body, and Mr. Crawley eloquently pleaded the justice of their cause at the bar of the House, which refused the charter by a majority of one. The seat of war was then transferred to public platforms and the newspapers, with such effect, that in 1840 the House was flooded with petitions for the charter. After a determined and bitter contest the Assembly granted it by a majority of twelve, the champion of the Baptists being Hon. J.W. Johnstone, a member of the Upper House; it also passed the Legislative Council.

The second struggle arose on a more questionable point. Large appropriations were made by the Legislature in aid of King's and Dalhousie Colleges, and the Baptists thought it but common justice that they should share in the public fund set apart for higher education; some few of them, however, holding that this position compromised the principle of voluntary support. This demand re-opened the whole question of college policy for the Province, the leading liberal politicians favoring the plan of one central university. The Baptists boldly entered the political arena, made Hon. J.W. Johnstone their candidate, elected him to the Legislature by an overwhelming majority and pressed their claim successfully. He was a gentleman of the highest character, of fine culture and splendid abilities. Afterwards, for many years, he was Attorney General and Premier of the Province; he also filled the chair of Chief Justice with distinction, and declined the governorship of the Province shortly before his death. In 1863 an unsuccessful attempt was made to rehabilitate Dalhousie as the Provincial University. Failing in that, a larger scheme was proposed, under which denominational colleges should each receive an annual grant for a term of years, on condition that they surrendered or held in reserve their powers to grant degrees. These

powers were to be transferred to a Provincial University to be established at Halifax. This was not to be a teaching institution, but simply an examining body empowered to confer degrees and to prescribe the curricula for all the affiliated colleges. After an animated debate at the Baptist Convention, held at Sackville, 1876, the proposition to affiliate Acadia College with the Halifax University was negatived by a large majority.

This college has had a perpetual struggle with financial difficulties consequent on its small and by no means wealthy constituency, but it has made constant progress, and its influence on the ministry and Churches is seen everywhere in their liberal culture, their intellectual and spiritual development. The first effort to raise an endowment was made in 1852, and by various other efforts the amount has been increased to about \$100,000. In 1849 it was adopted as the College of the Baptists in the three Maritime Provinces. Many of its students have attained considerable distinction, and hold responsible positions in the Dominion and the United States. Dr. Crawley, who did so much to establish it and was its first president, felt compelled to resign that office in 1856, to attend to certain private business affairs which, for the time being, demanded his entire attention. But after their arrangement, in 1865, he returned to his work as an educator, accepting the chair of Classics, and for a time he also served as Principal in the Theological Department. He still retains his connection with the Institution as Professor Emeritus. Acadia College was never in a more prosperous condition than at present.

The venerable J.M. Cramp, D.D., whose name will ever be associated with the College as its second President, was the son of Rev. Thomas Cramp, a Baptist minister in the Isle of Thanet, was born in 1796, baptized in 1812, and was educated at Stepney College. He was

Chapter 18 - Baptists in British America and Australia

ordained in 1818 as pastor of the Bean Street Baptist Church, Southwark, London. Subsequently, for fourteen years, he assisted his father in the pastorate of St. Peter's. Church, in his native town. In 1840 he became pastor of the Church at Hastings, Sussex. Four years later he was sent by the Committee of the Canada Baptist Missionary Society to take charge of the Montreal Baptist College; and in 1857 he became President and Professor of Moral Philosophy in Acadia College. He continued in active service till the infirmities of age compelled him to retire, in 1869, when he was made Professor Emeritus; his death occurred a few years later. Dr. Cramp's attainments were extensive; he was a good Hebrew scholar, a sound theologian, and thoroughly versed in Ecclesiastical History, as is seen in his 'Baptist History.' He was a true friend of a pure Bible, always insisting on fidelity to God in the translation of his Word. His character was sweet and unselfish, his aims were high, and his life stainless and full of affability. As a writer he is well known by his 'Text Book of Popery,' which is regarded as authoritative, also by his 'Paul and Christ,' and numerous other publications.

Rev. A.W. Sawyer, D.D., the present President of Acadia College, is a native of Vermont, and a graduate of Dartmouth College, of the class of 1847. He completed his theological course at Newton, and was ordained in 1853. He was appointed to the chair of Classics in Acadia in 1855, which chair he resigned in 1860. He then served as pastor of the Church at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., and as Principal of the New London Academy, N.H., but in 1869 he accepted the Presidency of Acadia, with the chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy. While Dr. Sawyer is very unassuming and quiet, he is one of the foremost educators in the Dominion. He is accurate and extensive in his scholarship, keen in his

perception, close and logical in his habit of thought. In the class-room he has few equals in throwing the student back upon his own resources and compelling him to make his best intellectual efforts. The efficient staff of tutors, with himself, are making the Institution a blessing to the Denomination, as one of the agencies which are doing so much to make the Baptists more and more powerful in the Maritime Provinces.

THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, formerly Lower Canada, is another interesting field of Baptist labor. The first Baptist Church in this Province, of which we find any record, was formed in 1794 at Caldwell's Manor, not far from the Vermont border. For many years this neighborhood had been occupied by Loyalist Refugees, mostly from Connecticut. Rev. John Hubbard and Ariel Kendrick, missionaries of the Woodstock (Vt.) Baptist Association, visited and preached in this settlement; their labors were greatly blessed; Rev. Elisha Andrews, of Fairfax, baptized about thirty converts and formed them into a Church. Two years later some of its members removed to a new township called Eaton, south of the St. Lawrence, in the district of Three Rivers, and were organized into a Church. Several others were formed in this part of Lower Canada under the labors of the Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Society. Benedict speaks of three of these as members of the Fairfield Association in 1812, namely, these of St. Armand, Stanbridge and Dunham. A somewhat similar movement took place in Upper Canada, now Ontario, in 1794. Reuben Crandall, then a licentiate, settled at Hallowell, in what is now the County of Prince Edward, on the northern shore of Lake Ontario, and in the following year he organized a Church. Another licentiate, T. Finch, organized a Church in Thurlow, now Haldimand, about 1804, which seems to have been known as the Charlotteville Church, and

in a comparatively few years eight Churches were set off from this body. Other laborers established Churches about the same time in Cramahe, Rawdon, and neighboring places. About 1803 the first Association in this district was formed, called the Thurlow, but afterwards the Haldimand Association, and this was a center of Baptist influence until this region of Canada became dotted with Baptist Churches gathered into several Associations. Thus it is seen that the pioneer Churches of Quebec and Ontario, as well as those of the Maritime Provinces, were planted by missionaries from the United States, excepting the elder Churches embraced in what is now the Ottawa Association. The members who first composed its Churches, with their pastors, were largely emigrants from Scotland. The eldest of these, Breadalbane, was organized in 1817 with thirteen members, all Scotch, their first elders being Duncan Campbell and Donald McLaurin. Next in order was the Clarence Church, 1817, formed of seven members. John Edwards, who was instrumental in its formation, was converted in Edinburgh under the ministry of the Haldanes. Other Churches in the valley of the Ottawa, as Dalesville and Osgoode, have a similar origin and history.

The first Baptist Church of Montreal was not organized till 1830, but it naturally took a leading part in originating and shaping the missionary and educational work in this part of Canada. Rev. John Gilmour, of Aberdeen, was its first pastor, a zealous leader in denominational work for many years. These and most of the other Churches in the eastern part of Canada, during the first quarter of the present century, practiced open communion, a subject which for many years kept them in grievous friction with those of the western part. The eastern Churches held with right good Scotch grip all the orthodox doctrines, as well as to the immersion of believers on their trust in

Christ. But they regarded the edification of the brethren and the observance of the Supper as the chief ends of the Gospel Church, losing sight of its aggressive character. They believed that evangelists should be supported while preaching, but gave no remuneration to the elders of their own Churches. They made the plurality of elders, the weekly celebration of the Supper, the liberty of the unordained to administer ordinances, and exhortations on the Lord's day, binding as duties on the whole brotherhood. Unanimity was required in all their decisions, and if a minority dissented the majority took their reasons for dissent into consideration. If these were found valid the majority altered their decision; if not, they exhorted the minority to repentance, but if they repented not they were excommunicated. They held that the exercise of discipline on the Lord's day was a part of divine worship, and they never neglected the duty of purging out the 'old leaven,' but rather enjoyed the exercise. Down to 1834, including the Montreal and Breadalbane Churches, they numbered but four Churches and three ministers.

In the years 1834-35 a memorable revival of religion gave new life to the Baptist cause in Eastern Canada. It began in Montreal and extended through the Churches of the valley, the immediate result being that the Churches came nearer to each other, and formed the Ottawa Association. A second revival, under the labors of Messrs. McPhail, Fyfe, and other ardent young missionaries, was enjoyed three or four years later. Its center was in Osgoode and vicinity, and it gave a fresh impulse to the spread of Baptist principles. The growth of the denomination in the West was more rapid. The fertile regions bordering on the Upper St. Lawrence and lakes Ontario and Erie invited a large influx of population. The Haldimand Association included the Churches in the London district, but the Upper Canada

Association, which held its first meeting in 1819, embraced the neighborhood which includes Toronto and Brantford. In 1839 there were five Regular and one 'Irregular,' or open communion, Baptist Association, their statistics being: Churches, 172; members, 3,722. Nine or ten Churches, with a membership of about 560, were not connected with any association, making in all about 4,282 members. The following statistics for 1885 indicate the growth of the denomination in the entire Dominion – Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Northwest Territory: Churches, 370; members, 28,987. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward's Island: Churches, 352; members, 40,989. The total for British America being: Of Churches, 122; and of members, 69,971.

At the first meeting of the Ottawa Association, in 1836, it resolved unanimously to send a deputation to Great Britain to solicit aid in the proclamation of the Gospel in Canada, and to establish an academy for the training of young men for the ministry. The academy was commenced in that year, Rev. Newton Bosworth taking charge of the instruction. Rev. John Gilmour visited England and Scotland as the agent of the Association, and received collections there of about \$5,000 for erecting a proper building, and a society was formed in London known as the Baptist Canadian Missionary Society. On Mr. Gilmour's return a similar society was formed in Canada, having for its aim the support of home missionaries and the promotion of theological education. It accomplished an excellent work. The 'Canada Baptist Magazine and Missionary Register' was published as a monthly for two or three years under its supervision; but it was discontinued about the year 1842, when a weekly paper appeared known as the 'Montreal Register.'

A root of bitterness in the communion question sprang up, which finally led to the

extinction of the Missionary Society in Canada, and this controversy between the Eastern and Western Baptists became more pronounced year by year. The Society disclaimed that it was an open communion body, and avowed that the Churches which it assisted were mainly strict communion bodies. Distrust abounded, and about the year 1854 the Western Canada Baptist Home Missionary Society was formed, under the auspices of the Strict Communionists, and the Montreal Society soon died. In 1843 the Canada Baptist Union had been formed, somewhat after the model of the English Union, its general objects being to promote the unity and prosperity of the denomination, 'especially to watch over our religious rights and privileges; to secure their permanence and promote their extension.' Ample scope was afforded for the exercise of its vigilance and wisdom. At that time the great doctrines of religious equality and freedom of conscience were not well understood in Canada, so that it fell to the lot of the Baptists to bring them and their defense to the front. They had to meet the Clergy Reserves Question, the outgrowth of a provision in the Constitutional Act of 1791, whereby an allotment equal in value to one seventh of all grants of public lands in Upper Canada was to be set apart for the support of a 'Protestant clergy.' These reserves soon became valuable, while the ambiguity of the phrase 'Protestant clergy' made it a subject of contention amongst the Protestant denominations for many years. Some claimed that the word Protestant was merely the antithesis of 'Catholic,' and so, that the reserves were for the benefit of all sects which abjured the tenets of the Roman Catholics. Others maintained as stoutly that the word 'clergy' designated only the ministers of the Church of England, and it had never been applied in any British statute to any ministers but these of that Church and of Rome. The Baptists, true to their

The American Baptists

principles, refused to apply for any portion of these funds, but insisted on their secularization and use for legitimate State purposes. Messrs. Davies, Cramp, Gilmour, Girdwood and Fyfe, their leaders, denied the right of the State to vote lands or money to any Church, and demanded religious equality before the law, leaving all denominations to support themselves.

The same principles were involved and the same ground was taken in regard to university endowment. In 1797 the English Government had authorized the Legislative Council and House of Assembly in Upper Canada to set apart the land of ten townships, equal to half a million of acres, as a foundation for four Grammar-Schools and a University. At this period the Executive, the Legislature and the Councils were, almost without exception, members of the dominant Church, and cast their influence so solidly for the Episcopal High Church party that it became known as the 'Family Compact.' Arch-deacon, afterwards Bishop Strachan, a crafty, resolute and not over-scrupulous politician, was at their head. Backed by powerful friends and using many machinations he secured from the Imperial Parliament the fund for the establishment of an Episcopal University and the postponement of the erection of the Grammar Schools. The Executive Government was also to be created a permanent, commission, with power to dispose of the lands and manage the revenues, and so to remove them beyond the reach of popular control. This high-handed attempt to saddle an Established Church and an exclusively Episcopal University upon the infant province was resisted by the Baptists at every step. They petitioned the Government and remonstrated strenuously, and after much other action their Union, in 1845, gave the following as their voice on the subject:

'That in our estimation the most just, and ultimately the most satisfactory settlement of the so-called University Question, would be founded on the following general principles: To confine the funds of the University exclusively to the Faculties of Arts, Sciences, Law and Medicine, giving no support whatever to Theological Professors of any denomination, but leaving each sect to support out of its own resources its teachers in divinity.'

This was followed in 1853 with an utterance through their Missionary Society, in words declaring:

'In the most emphatic and decided manner its determination never to rest satisfied until the Clergy Reserves are secularized by the Government,' and the 'fixed resolution of the Churches throughout the entire Province of Canada, to resist by every lawful and available means any and every attempt which may be made by the Government, or otherwise, to induce the Baptist denomination, in particular, and the other religious denominations in Canada, to accept of any partition of the Clergy Reserves Fund, for any purpose whatever.'

Partition had been pressed in some quarters as a basis of settlement, but, true to their ancient faith, the Baptists would have none of it; they finally triumphed, and as the result Canada now enjoys the same religious liberty that is secured to all in the United States.

In regard to Baptist periodicals in Canada West, it may be well to say, that after one or two futile attempts, the 'Christian Messenger' began its publication at Brantford, in 1853, but in 1859 it was removed to Toronto, and its name was afterwards changed to the 'Canadian Baptist,' which is still published as the leading organ of Baptist opinion. A few years since, it was purchased by a company of which the Hon. William McMaster is the principal stockholder. The constitution of the company makes the various denominational Societies the joint

beneficiaries of the net profits of the paper. But with his characteristic liberality, Mr. McMaster announced in October, 1886, his readiness to hand over the paid-up stock held by him, amounting to \$40,000, to those Societies, which are now quite numerous.

During the last thirty-four years, the Baptist Home Mission Society of Ontario, has planted seventy self-sustaining Churches, and more than seven thousand converts have been baptized on its field, west of the city of Kingston. During the last year it helped to support sixty-two feeble Churches and maintained preaching at sixty out-stations. The Baptists of that vicinity have expended about \$130,000 in home mission work. The field occupied by the Eastern Society lies amongst a population two thirds of whom speak French and are Roman Catholics. The French-speaking people are crowding the English-speaking people out, and many of our Churches are depleted, yet in 1885 one hundred and thirteen converts were baptized on the field. Steps are already taken for the union of the Eastern and Western Conventions.

During the first seven years of the Foreign Mission Society of Ontario and Quebec it was auxiliary to the American Baptist Missionary Union; but in 1873 it undertook an independent mission to the Telugus. Six missionaries with their wives, and two unmarried female missionaries, have been sent to that field. During twelve years the Society has expended more than \$100,000 in foreign work, and within the last two years Rev. A.V. Timpany and Rev. G.F. Currie have died at their posts as missionaries. The Foreign Missionary Society of the Maritime Provinces sustains about the same number of laborers and both of them employ several native preachers also. The 'elect' ladies in all the provinces are rendering efficient aid by auxiliary societies and a monthly paper, the 'Missionary Link,' which

does good service in the same cause.

The Grand Ligne Mission, in the Province of Quebec, has been in operation for half a century, and has been the means of bringing about 5,000 persons to the knowledge of the truth, who are now scattered over Canada, the New England States and the far West. About 3,000 of these passed several years in the schools of the mission, and are spreading abroad the light which they received there. T.S. Shenston, Esq., of Brantford, Treasurer of the Foreign Missionary Society of Ontario and Quebec, is one of the noblest laymen in Canada. During the most critical years of its history he was Treasurer of its Board and has always been amongst its most liberal supporters. He was born in London, England, in 1822, and came to Canada when but nine years of age. Endowed with superior native ability, controlled by unflinching integrity and industry, he has risen to great usefulness and honor. He commenced life as a farmer, but at the age of twenty-seven was made a magistrate in Oxford County, where he resided. There were seventy-five magistrates in that county, and the returns of convictions show that he did more magisterial business than all of them put together. In 1851 he published a 'County Warden and Municipal Officer's Assistant,' and in 1852 an 'Oxford Gazetteer.' He set up type and printed with his own hands a work on 'Baptism,' in 1864, and for many years he has held the office of Register of Brant County. In conjunction with another generous soul, for years he sustained an Orphan House for twenty-two girls in Brantford. He is senior deacon of the "First Baptist Church in that city, and has been the Superintendent of its Sabbath-school for the better part of twenty-five years. In addition to the books here named he has published several others, amongst them, 'The Sinner and his Saviour' (256 pages), and an ingenious 'Perpetual Calendar,' reliable for

some hundreds of years. All this is the work of what is called a 'self-made' man.

A brief sketch of Baptist Educational work will be acceptable. In 1838 the Committee of the London Society sent out Dr. Benjamin Davies to take charge of the Theological Institution at Montreal, known as the 'Canada Baptist College.' As the number of students increased a comfortable stone building was purchased, where the work was done with tolerable efficiency until 1843, when Dr. Davies returned to London to act as a Professor in Regent's Park College. Rev. Robert A. Fyfe had charge of the Montreal Institution in 1843-44, and was succeeded by the Rev. J.M. Cramp; but in an evil hour a costly edifice was built, and its debts were so heavy that in 1849 it succumbed; the library and property were sold and it was discontinued. While it was in operation it did an excellent work; and many of its students of high character are a blessing to the Churches still; its managers and supporters were liberal and large hearted and its tutors were able men. But its location was 400 miles east of the principal center of Canadian Baptist population, its sympathies and methods were not sufficiently American, it was thought to cherish open communion sentiments, and at that time there was little love amongst the Baptists of Canada West for an educated ministry; all of which causes contributed to its downfall. Since this unhappy failure no further attempt has been made to establish a Baptist institution of learning in Lower Canada.

Several abortive attempts were put forth in this direction in the West, the most ambitious of which was in connection with the 'Maclay College,' projected in 1852. Dr. Maclay, an indefatigable friend of education, was induced to make the attempt to raise £10,000 for the establishment of a Theological Institution, more than half of which sum was subscribed. Dr. Maclay was chosen President, but declined to

serve; the managers and subscribers failed to agree amongst themselves as to a successor, and in other things, and the scheme fell to the ground. Dr. Fyfe devised a practicable plan for a Canadian Baptist College, in 1856, which, after much arduous labor and anxious care has been crowned with success. Rev. Robert A. Fyfe, D.D., was born in Lower Canada, in 1816, was baptized in 1835, and almost immediately after left for Madison University to prepare for the ministry. Want of means and ill health compelled him to return home within a year, but he continued his studies first at Montreal and then at the 'Manual Labor High School,' Worcester, Mass. He entered Newton Theological Seminary in 1839 and graduated thence in 1842. After several years of successful pastoral labor in other places, he became pastor of the Bond Street Church, Toronto. He submitted to the denomination his scheme for a school with a literary and theological department, providing for the admission of both sexes in the literary department, which project was indorsed, but with much misgiving. Woodstock was chosen as its site, and after three or four years of hard struggle a substantial building was erected there. In 1860 Dr. Fyfe was constrained to resign his pastorate and accept the principalship, from which time until his death, in 1878, he devoted all his powers to its interests. The first edifice was destroyed by fire just as the Institution was opening its doors to students, and years of self-denying effort were buried in heaps of ashes and blackened bricks, with a debt of \$6,000 on the smoking embers. With characteristic courage he immediately began to rebuild, and in the face of difficulty, discouragement and gloom, two better buildings were erected, one for the exclusive use of the ladies' department. His death removed a prince from our Canadian Israel. In the Theological Department, for some years

before his death, Rev. John Crawford, D.D., and Rev. John Torrance had been associated with him, and after his death the work of the Institute was conducted under two heads for a time. Professor Torrance was Principal of the Theological, and Professor J.E. Wells was Principal of the Literary Department.

The policy of the Canadian Baptists in educational work was greatly changed by the munificence of the Hon. William McMaster. Before Dr. Fyfe's death the opinion had begun to obtain that Toronto was the proper place for the Theological College, but the dread of creating division in the interests of Woodstock, and the apparent impossibility of raising money to erect a college worthy of the denomination in that growing city, made all shrink from the attempt. At that point, what had seemed utterly impossible was made practicable by Senator McMaster's liberality. This great philanthropist was born in the county of Tyrone, Ireland, in 1811. He received a good English education in a private school, and in 1833 came to Canada, at the age of twenty-two years. He soon entered upon a most successful and honorable mercantile career, in the wholesale dry-goods business, having first been a clerk and then a partner of Robert Cathcart. When Montreal was the great distributing center for Western Canada, he was one of the few whose commercial enterprise and ability transferred a share of the wholesale trade from that city to Toronto. Having established his firm there and associated two of his nephews with himself his business became immense, until he retired from active partnership to follow financial transactions, for which his foresight and sound judgment amply fitted him, so that he became one of the leading capitalists of the province. He has always been a Liberal in his politics, and in 1856 he was with much reluctance induced to accept a nomination as a candidate for the Legislative Council of Canada. He was

elected by a large majority, and at the Confederation was appointed to the Senate of the Dominion.

Mr. McMaster has always taken a marked interest in the educational interests of Canada. In 1865 he was appointed a member of the Council of Public Instruction, and, in 1873, he was made a Senator of the Provincial University by Government appointment. All the educational enterprises of the Baptists have been aided largely by his wisdom and purse, being one of the largest subscribers to the Woodstock Institute; and at the Missionary Convention of Ontario, held at St. Catharines in 1879, it was resolved that, in view of certain proposals made by him, the Theological Department of the Institute at Woodstock should be removed to Toronto. At once he purchased from the University of Toronto a plot of ground 250 feet square, and immediately erected thereon one of the most beautiful and complete college buildings in the country. He vested this property in a Board of Trustees in 1880, to be held in trust for the Baptist denomination. At the first meeting of this Board Rev. J.H. Castle, D.D., was elected President of the College; Rev. John Torrance, A.M. Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Apologetics, and at a subsequent meeting Professor A.H. Newman, D.D., LL.D., of Rochester Seminary, was chosen for the Chair of Church History and Old Testament Exegesis. A brief notice of several of our brethren who have done such splendid work in Canada must close this sketch of Baptists there.

Dr. Castle was born at Milestown, Penn., in 1830, was baptized in 1846, graduated from the Lewisburg University in 1851, and received his Doctor's degree from the same institution in 1866. He was settled as pastor at Pottsville; Pa., for two years and a half, when he accepted the charge of the First Baptist Church in West Philadelphia, where he remained for fourteen

years. In 1873 he became pastor of the Bond Street Church, Toronto, when the beautiful structure known as the Jarvis Street Meeting-house was erected for his congregation, Mr. McMaster contributing about \$60,000 to the building fund. He declined the Principalship of Woodstock, and when its Theological Department was removed to Toronto all eyes turned to him as eminently fitted to become its President. This position he has filled, and the chair of Systematic Theology and Pastoral Theology, with great success.

Professor Torrance, who first became Principal of the Woodstock Institution, had previously been a student there and a graduate of the Toronto University, but he died before he could engage in the work of the new College. The report of the Trustees speaks of him as an accurate scholar; 'His force and clearness as a thinker, the soundness of his views as a theologian, his aptness as a teacher, his reputation in the denomination, and his unflinching Christian integrity gave every reason to hope for him a long career of the highest usefulness.'

Dr. Newman is a native of Edgefield County, S.C., and was born in 1852. He graduated from Mercer University, Georgia, in 1871, and from Rochester Theological Seminary in 1875. He spent a year 1875-76 in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, where, as resident graduate, he devoted himself to the study of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic and Patristic Greek. From 1877 to 1880 he was acting as Professor of Church History at Rochester, and in 1880-81 was Pettingill Professor in the same institution. He translated and edited Immer's 'Hermeneutics of the New Testament,' published at Andover in 1877, and is the author of many review articles, evidencing extensive research and critical acumen. He is justly regarded also as an authority in ecclesiastical history, especially in

its relation to the principles and polity of the Baptists. If his valuable life is spared, Baptist literature will be greatly enriched by His fruitful pen. At present the Doctor is editing the 'Anti-Manichæan Treatises of St. Augustin,' with a revised translation, notes and an introduction on the Manichæan Heresy.

Malcolm MacVicar, Ph.D., LL.D., fills the vacancy left by the death of Professor Torrance. He was Principal of the State Normal School at Ypsilanti, Mich., and his career as an educator has been successful and distinguished. He was born in Scotland in 1829, but in 1835 came to Chatham, in Ontario. He entered Knox College, Toronto, in 1850, with Donald, his brother, now Principal of the Presbyterian College in Montreal. While a student Malcolm's doctrinal views changed, he became a Baptist, and was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1856. He graduated from Rochester University in 1859, from which time to 1863 he served as Professor of Mathematics, and from that date to 1867 as Principal of Brockport Collegiate Institute, N.Y. From 1868 he was Superintendent of Public Schools in Leavenworth, Kan., then Principal of the Normal School in Potsdam, N.Y., before he went to the Normal School in Michigan. Dr. MacVicar is the author of several valuable textbooks in arithmetic and geography. He excels as a mathematician and metaphysician, and has made a special study of the relations of science to religion. He is critical, original and enthusiastic.

Rev. W.N. Clarke, D.D., was for many years pastor of the Churches at Newton Center, Mass., and at Montreal, but took the chair of New Testament Exegesis at Toronto in 1884. He brought broad views and a loving spirit to his work, and having published a most valuable commentary on one of the Gospels, he possesses special fitness for this high position. His compeer, Rev. D.M. Welton, D.D., Ph.D., an advanced scholar in the Oriental languages,

fills the chair of Old Testament Exegesis. Dr. Welton is a graduate of Acadia, also of a celebrated German University, and was for some years the Principal of the Theological Department in Acadia College.

Theodore H. Rand, M.A., D.C.L., was appointed to a chair in Toronto College in 1885-86. He is a graduate of Acadia, and was in succession the Superintendent of Education in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick, in both of which provinces he inaugurated and kept in operation for a number of years the noble system of free schools which they now possess. He filled a chair also in Acadia before he removed to Toronto. The entire cost of sustaining all these professorships, in addition to the large sum expended in building 'McMaster Hall' and in endowing the President's chair, was cheerfully assumed by Mr. McMaster.

Rev. Wolverton, B.A., was appointed Principal at Woodstock after the resignation of Mr. Torrance. He had previously obtained and collected pledges for its endowment to the amount of \$40,000, with the intention of raising the amount to \$100,000. For some time Senator McMaster had purposed to thoroughly equip an Arts College in connection with the University of Toronto, but has now determined to devote this handsome endowment to the Woodstock foundation. In view of this great work, Dr. Rand has been induced to accept the Principalship of Woodstock, while Professor Wolverton will devote all his time to its financial management. Mr. McMaster stipulated that \$56,000 should be raised by the denomination for new buildings and other improvements, of which sum \$50,000 has been raised, and a new impulse has been given to Baptist educational enterprises all through Canada. University powers will be sought for Woodstock College, and the corner-stone of the splendid new college building was laid at

Woodstock, October 22, 1886, by Mrs. Wm. McMaster, when addresses were delivered by Dr. Band and Dr. McArthur, of New York. The progress and development of the Baptists in Canada for the last quarter of a century have been wonderful, and they bid fair to make greater advancement still for the coming generation. Without referring to particular pages, it may suffice to say that the above facts have been collected chiefly from 'Cramp's History,' 'Benedict's History,' 'Bill's Fifty Years in the Maritime Provinces,' minutes of Associations, Missionary Reports, Memorials of Acadia College and the Canadian Year-Books.

AUSTRALASIA proper comprises New South Wales, Victoria, South and North Australia, Queensland and West Australia, covering about 3,000,000 square miles. Captain Cook discovered New South Wales in 1770, and slowly British subjects have settled the greater part of the continent, while the aborigines have largely decreased. Rev. John Saunders may be regarded as the founder of Baptists in Australia. At the age of seventeen he became a member of a Baptist Church at Camberwell, in London, and renounced every opportunity to take a seat in Parliament, preferring labor for Christ. After establishing two Churches in London, his heart was set on planting a Christian colony in that stronghold of idolatry and other wickedness, Botany Bay. On reaching Sidney, in 1834, he commenced to preach in the most fervid and powerful manner in the Court-house, where crowds flocked to hear him. He soon formed the Bathurst Street Church and remained its pastor till 1848, when his health broke. He then retired from the pastorate and died in 1859. The loss of so vigorous a leader dampened the courage of his Church, but it revived under the new leadership of Rev. James Voller, whose labors were greatly blessed, and an Association was formed,

The American Baptists

so that now the Baptist force is most earnest and vigorous in New South Wales. The number of Churches is 22, the number of members, 1,196.

VICTORIA. The Baptist cause was planted there by Rev. William Ham, in 1845, when the first Church was formed. This pioneer labored under the greatest difficulties, but a church edifice was built in Collins Street, Melbourne, in which he labored for some years. Little progress was made, however, until 1856, when the Rev. James Taylor, of Glasgow, took the pastoral oversight. His scriptural and logical preaching, accompanied by a peculiar unction from above, soon drew large audiences, so that the congregation removed to the Grand Opera House, which seated 2,000 people, and yet was too small for the throng. Soon, a large and beautiful church edifice was built, which is now the rallying point for the annual gatherings of our Churches in the colony. Mr. Taylor is still preaching to an earnest Church at Richmond, a suburb of Melbourne. Two sons of Mr. Ham are amongst the most liberal supporters of the denomination in the colony; the eldest acted as chairman of the Victorian Baptist Association at its session a year ago. A second Church was organized in Melbourne, which was under the pastoral care of Rev. W.P. Scott till his death, in 1856; and when the great gold discovery demoralized the community, the Missionary Society in England, at the earnest request of the Church for a suitable pastor, sent the Rev. Isaac New to fill the vacancy. At that time, Melbourne was shaping itself into a magnificent city, with many social refinements and educational institutions; and the pulpits of all denominations were being filled with preachers of a high order. Mr. New's finished thought and fresh delivery attracted great congregations, and in 1859 the elegant chapel in Albert Street was erected for this Church. But in ten years, failing health compelled this

great preacher to retire from his work, and in 1886 he fell asleep in Christ. There are 100 preaching places in Victoria and about 15,000 persons who enjoy the services of their ministers, the membership of the Churches being nearly 6,000, and the number of Sunday-school scholars about 9,000. Our Churches there are in a flourishing condition and number 39, with a membership of 4,235. Rev. S. Chapman, the present pastor of Collins Street, is a most successful minister, who has set his heart on raising \$250,000 for home mission purposes with every indication of success. He proposes to establish an inter-Colonial College, to form a building fund for opening new fields and to aid struggling Churches in town and country.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA. Before Mr. Scott settled in Melbourne, he spent two years as pastor in this colony. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the Hinders Street Church, Adelaide, was held in September, 1886, at which it was reported that since its organization 1,581 members had been added to that Church, and its average fiscal income had been \$10,000 per annum. Dr. Silas Mead has rendered great service to the denomination during a quarter of a century, but the Baptists are not strong in the colony. The denomination has lacked compact organization, many of its members preferring isolation to combined activity. For the present, many of the other denominations are in advance of the Baptists, because they have accepted State aid and the appropriations of large plots of land for ecclesiastical purposes, which offers Baptists have declined on principle. The number of Churches is 52, the membership of the Associated Baptist Churches in South Australia is 5,190, Sabbath-school scholars 5,191.

QUEENSLAND. There were no Baptists in this colony in the old convict days, when the incorrigible from Port Jackson, New South

Chapter 18 - Baptists in British America and Australia

Wales, were sent to Moreton Bay. But immediately upon the settlement of free persons a Church was established. Mr. Stewart preached for some time in the Court-house, he being followed by Rev. B.G. Wilson, in 1856, when a substantial chapel was built in Wharf Street, but a much larger and more beautiful building is now in course of erection. The Churches number 13, and have all sprung from this one Church, the Baptist Church membership of the colony being 1,355, with Sunday-school scholars under their care to the number of about 2,000.

NEW ZEALAND. The principal Churches of this colony are at Dunedin, the capital in the South Island, and Auckland, the principal city of the North Island. The present pastor of the Church at Auckland is Rev. Thomas Spurgeon, son of the London divine. A Tabernacle, seating 1,500 people, has been opened, which is too small for the multitude who throng to hear him. This Church was organized by Rev. J. Thornton, and a few miles southeast of Auckland, Rev. Josiah Hinton, a son of the late John Howard Hinton, of London, is laboring earnestly. Flourishing young Churches are found, also, at Wellington, the capital, at Christ Church, Nelson and other places. About 50,000 only of the Maoris, the aborigines, are left, and the Baptists are doing something to bring them to Christ. Fronde says that gunpowder, rum and tobacco have ruined this once noble race, which is so fast melting away before civilization. In the two Islands we have 23 Churches, and 2,398 members.

TASMANIA. Rev. H. Bowling left Colchester, England, for this field in 1831; it was then known as Van Diemen's Land. He commenced at once to proclaim the Gospel, and for thirty-five years continued to preach in this beautiful Island. But the struggle was hard as well as long, for at present there are but 8 Churches with 404 communicants in the

colony, and 625 scholars in the Sunday-schools. William Gibson, Esq., and his son, have recently built and presented to the denomination four beautiful church edifices, one at Launceston, with a seating capacity of 1,500, the others are at Perth, Coleraine and Longford.

Although there are no Baptists in Western Australia, the progress made in the other colonies within the last ten years presents an encouraging feature in the ecclesiastical life of Australasia. Everywhere, heroic effort is made and new plans are projected for more thorough work. Men of large ability and experience are prosecuting these plans. James Martin, who was pastor of the Collins Street Church, Melbourne, for seven years, did much for our Churches, both as a preacher and writer; his name, with these of William Poole, David Rees, George Slade, Henry Langdon and Alexander Shain, has done much to stimulate the consecration of Baptists there, and others of equally heroic devotion are ready to enter into their labors full of work and full of hope. The denominational papers in Australasia, are 'The Banner of Truth,' in New South Wales; 'The Freeman,' in Queensland; and in South Australia, 'Truth and Progress.'

And now, having traced the stream of truth in its flow from Bethlehem to this newest discovered end of the earth, which, though the largest Island in the world, may not improperly be called a continent, and has, because of its vast extent, been called the 'fifth quarter of the world,' we see how nearly primitive Christianity belts the globe in its new embrace of 'Southern Asia.' This history shows the extreme jealousy of the Baptists for the honor of Scripture as the revelation of Christ's will. For this they have endured all their sufferings, each pain evincing their love to him and their zeal to maintain his will according to the Scriptures. It appears to be as true of error as it

is of the truth itself, that a little leaven 'leavens the whole lump,' when once it comes into juxtaposition with the genuine meal and the fermenting process takes up one single particle. Every individual error which has crept into the Churches since the times of the Apostles is directly traceable to a perversion of Scripture, and generally corruption of doctrine has come by the misinterpretation of Scripture. In most cases the rise of divergence from the Bible sense can be traced not only to a change of manner, however slight, but also to that change at a given point of time, and from these they have run to the very opposite of Christ's teaching and example. A marked illustration of this is found in both the Christian ordinances. Take, for example, the Supper. Our Lord instituted it in the evening and after he and his disciples had eaten the roasted paschal lamb with bread and herbs. But as if for sheer contradiction of Christ, in the days of Cyprian and Augustine, the Churches came to the notion that the Supper should be forbidden in the evening and taken in the morning while fasting. The pretense was, that reverence for Christ would not allow its elements to mingle with common food. So perfectly fanatical did men become in this perversion, that Walafrid Strabo said: 'The Church has enjoined on us to act in the teeth of Christ's example and we must obey the Church.' He was the Abbot of Reichenau, A.D. 842, no mean authority; and a prolific writer, whose works, says Reuss, 'for several centuries formed the principal source and the highest authority of biblical science in the Latin Church, and were used down to the seventeenth century.' Dr. Hebbert says of him: 'He turns the argument round, and puts it that those who think our Lord's example ought to be followed are calumniating the Church in assuming that the Church would or could give a wrong order in such a thing!'

So, the bulwark of infant baptism has been

found in the words of Jesus: 'Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' despite the fact that one Apostle says, that he 'blessed them' and 'prayed for them,' but so far from saying that he baptized them, another is careful to say, that 'Jesus baptized not.' Exactly in the same way infallible headship is attributed to the Pope, from a false interpretation of the words: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church.' The power of priestly absolution is claimed on a perversion of the words: 'Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted to them.' By the same forced construction, auricular confession is extorted from the passage 'Confess your faults one to another,' extreme unction, from a false use of the passage: 'Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil,...and the Lord shall raise him up;' but this office is not done till the man is dying. Purgatory is drawn from the abused passage which speaks of Christ preaching to 'the spirits in prison;' the right of private judgment is denied because Peter said: 'No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation;' and the worship of Mary is enforced because it is written: 'Blessed art thou among women.' The tortures of the Inquisition are justified because Paul said that he delivered Hymeneus and Alexander 'over to Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme,' and the burning of heretics, by the words of the same Apostle when he instructed the Corinthians to deliver the fornicator to 'Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The truth can only be conserved by holding it in righteousness, without wresting it from its natural testimony and obliging it to do duty in enforcing the traditions of men. For this reason Baptists must ever keep the doctrines of Jesus and his ordinances, and the order of his Church,

as they were delivered unto them, being faithful unto the death.

This narrative makes it clear that the principles of New Testament Christianity have never been wholly eradicated from the consciousness of some Christians in history. When perversions and abuses have multiplied, and the most godly men have feared that a pure and spiritual Christianity was about to perish from the earth, God has not left himself without witnesses, who have appealed to the authority of his word against the corruptions of their age. Their testimony has been as enlivening as a gust of fresh air, fanning the latent spark of religious life into a blaze. When the purest organic communities have been interrupted and broken, the truth has never compromised itself any more than its Author has compromised himself. With more or less distinctness, individual believers have ever maintained the teachings of Christ. Their spirits have been emancipated from mere ecclesiastical authority, as they have sought with honest hearts to learn and to do the will of God revealed in the Bible. In doing this they have been the worthy successors of the Bible Baptists.

These historical facts should give new hope to the Gospel Churches of our own times. Many who claim to be actuated by the scientific spirit and methods of our day, have proclaimed open hostility to all forms of assumed privilege and prescription. No institution, however venerable, can hold its own against this combination, unless it can show a valid reason for its existence. Many signs show that this attack will not cease until social order and possibly civil government have been fundamentally reconstructed. The Churches of Christ must also meet this assault. More and more their doctrines and observances must be called in question, and in so far as they are justified by an appeal to ancient traditions and usages, to old organizations and their authority, the

advance of the modern spirit will prevail against them. Only those Churches which stand firmly upon the New Testament, holding no faith or practice but what it enjoins, will stand in a position that cannot be successfully assailed until their great Divine Charter is demonstrated to be of human origin. When the New Testament, which has survived in immortal youth and strength, despite all destructive forces, has been torn into shreds, then those Churches will wane, but not till then. Baptists have taken this impregnable position, and so long as they hold it, sophistry and contempt, either from Christians or skeptics, can storm their fortress no sooner than a handful of snow-flakes can storm Gibraltar. Such attacks will simply make manifest the strength and simplicity of the faith once delivered to the saints. They must fail when the word of God fails, but not till then; for God will honor them so long as they honor his word.

The author's work is now done; and he here expresses devout gratitude to the Father of mercies for the health given him to finish his labor of love for the truth's sake. This work is now laid at his Master's feet as a tribute to the truth, for the edification of all who love the truth as Jesus revealed it in its fullness. It is tendered for the examination of all loving and candid Christians, regardless of name, with the fervent desire that it may be approved by the great Shepherd of the one flock, as an honest and faithful presentation of that truth which he promised should make his people free indeed. The writer's profound respect for other Christian denominations has not allowed him to utter a disrespectful word of them, however widely his views and theirs may differ on subjects which we hold to be very important. They are no more to blame either for the mistakes or faults of their forefathers, than Baptists are for the blunders or defects of their forefathers. When the countless millions of

The American Baptists

Christ's disciples meet our common Lord above, he will lovingly tell us which of us were right and which were wrong. If he shall say, 'My Baptist followers were mistaken in this or in that,' it will be their privilege to thank him for saving them despite these failures. And if he shall say, 'My Pedobaptist followers were

mistaken in this or in that,' the most ill-natured reply that any true Baptist can make will be: 'Dear brethren, we always told you so.' Then, for our eternal salvation, we shall all heartily sing together, 'Unto him who hath loved us and redeemed us unto God, unto him be glory for ever and ever. Amen.'

Made in the USA
Monee, IL
05 June 2023



ec1ad94b-c75b-47a5-ac0e-00f7d6128aebR01

ICBM 0700750807587



LP 5 FW429

8813

9 798750 892587